

CONTENTS



	Page
THE RECRUITING OF COLLEGE STUDENTS, <i>Charles J. Turck</i> . . .	313
SOCIAL FORCES AFFECTING COLLEGE ENTRANCE, <i>Roy W. Bizler</i> . . .	327
THE DISTRIBUTION OF MARKS, <i>C. S. Yoakum</i> . . .	335
THE NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION AND THE STUDENT, <i>Richard R. Brown</i> . . .	342
THE USES AND LIMITATIONS OF TESTS IN SELECTING AND PLACING STUDENTS, <i>Robert G. Bernreuter</i> . . .	352
SYMPOSIUM: THE REGISTRAR'S OFFICE AS A SERVICE STATION FOR SCHOLARSHIP CHARTS, REPORTS, AND STATISTICS . . .	361
THE REGISTRAR'S REPORTS ON STUDENT GRADES, <i>H. H. Armsby</i> . . .	361
PRACTICE AT STANFORD UNIVERSITY, <i>J. P. Mitchell</i> . . .	374
GRADE PUBLICITY SERVICE BY THE REGISTRAR, <i>Marian Williams</i> . . .	380
A COMMITTEE ON COLLEGE GRADES, <i>J. R. Robinson</i> . . .	390
PRESENT OBSTACLES TO THE COMPARABILITY OF GRADES OF DIFFERENT INSTITUTIONS, <i>Alvan E. Duerr</i> . . .	395
SYMPOSIUM: THE REGISTRAR AS THE CUSTODIAN OF STANDARDS, <i>Alice L. Butler, Chairman</i> . . .	404
STANDARDS IN THE ADMISSION OF FRESHMEN, <i>Arthur F. Southwick</i> . . .	404
STANDARDS OF EVALUATION OF TRANSFER CREDITS, <i>H. W. Chandler</i> . . .	409
STANDARDS OF GRADING, <i>Annie C. Whiteside</i> . . .	412
SYMPOSIUM: THE REGISTRAR AND HIS RELATIONS WITH THE OUTSIDE WORLD, <i>W. S. Hoffman, Chairman</i> . . .	416
THE REGISTRAR AS A CONSTRUCTIVE CITIZEN, <i>Alma H. Preinkert</i> . . .	416
THE RELATIONS OF THE REGISTRAR WITH PARENTS OF FUTURE, PRESENT, AND PAST STUDENTS, <i>H. H. Armsby</i> . . .	419
THE RELATION OF THE REGISTRAR TO PROGRESSIVE MOVEMENTS IN THE FIELD OF EDUCATION, <i>M. E. Gladfeller</i> . . .	424
THE EDUCATIONAL FUNCTION OF THE REGISTRAR, <i>Mary B. J. Lehn</i> . . .	430
THE REGISTRAR AND THE QUESTIONNAIRE ADDICT, <i>H. W. Chandler</i> . . .	433
THE REGISTRAR AND HIS HOBBIES, <i>G. P. Tuttle</i> . . .	435
SYMPOSIUM: THE REGISTRAR AS AN ADMINISTRATOR, <i>E. J. Howell, Chairman</i> . . .	442
CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE OFFICE OF REGISTRAR TO THE STUDENT PERSONNEL PROGRAM AT INDIANA STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE, <i>H. E. Elder</i> . . .	442
SECTIONAL MEETINGS . . .	449
SECTION A—UNIVERSITIES, PROFESSIONAL AND TECHNICAL SCHOOLS, <i>Edith D. Cockins, Chairman</i> . . .	449
SECTION B—COLLEGES OF LIBERAL ARTS, TEACHERS COLLEGES, JUNIOR COLLEGES, AND NORMAL SCHOOLS, <i>Enock C. Dyrness, Chairman</i> . . .	478
CURRICULUM CHANGES AND THE REGISTRAR, <i>Carrie Mae Probst</i> . . .	478
OPEN FORUM: SUMMARY, <i>K. P. R. Neville</i> . . .	486
AN ANALYSIS OF ENROLMENTS AND DEGREES CONFERRED OVER A SIX-YEAR PERIOD, <i>Fred L. Kerr</i> . . .	493
BUSINESS SESSION . . .	504
DE PAUL UNIVERSITY HONORS JOHN C. McHUGH . . .	523
INDEX TO VOLUME XI . . .	545

ISSUED QUARTERLY: OCTOBER, JANUARY, APRIL, JULY

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE \$3.00

PUBLICATION OFFICE: 450 AHNAP STREET, MENASHA, WIS.

EDITORIAL OFFICE: OFFICE OF ADMISSIONS, UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO,
FIFTY-EIGHTH STREET AND ELLIS AVENUE, CHICAGO, ILL.

Entered as second-class matter at Menasha, Wisconsin, under the Act of August 24, 1912.



J. R. SAGE, 1936-37

Bulletin of *The American Association of Collegiate Registrars*

July
1936



Vol. XI
No. 4

The Recruiting of College Students

CHARLES J. TURCK

The recruiting of college students is not a new activity. Youth does not turn with a natural eagerness to learning. Even in Shakespeare's day, it was "the whining schoolboy, with his satchel and shining morning face, creeping like a snail, unwillingly, to school." In our day, we still employ truant officers or attendance officers in the public school system. When we cross over from the high school to the college level, we can be sure that relatively few students would bridge that gap if it were not for the recruiting powers of some school officials, some friends, some influences which the colleges have set in motion. At the outset of this paper, I would make it exceedingly plain that I do not question the value of the services rendered by the recruiting or enrolment officers of the colleges, who have presented to young minds, in fair and effective ways, the claims of higher education. I question methods that have been employed sometimes by a few, but not the activity itself.

The most powerful of the influences that bring young people to college today is the accepted tradition in the American family that it is both fashionable and profitable for Johnny to go on to college. While that tradition has brought to college halls many a Johnny who ought not to have come, it has practically guaranteed even in the time of depression a reasonably large entering class in nearly all our American colleges. For this we are frankly grateful. The builders of this tradition of the usefulness and distinction of a college career are the thousands of men and women, in and out of college halls,

who have so lived and worked that the American public accepts the claims of the colleges. For these builders we have no word of criticism; indeed, more power to them.

It is not my purpose to analyze this tradition of the value of a college education, except to say that as in the case of all great traditions, there must be an enormous amount of truth in its foundations. What I shall attempt to do in this paper is to point out how we have gone beyond the widely accepted ideas of the worth of college attendance. Instead of resting the case for our college on a general emphasis of the values of college education, we have tried to particularize the argument, and have occasionally gone to the absurd length of telling Johnny, "If you come to my college, you will be a great man; but if you go to that other school a few miles down the river, you will be a tramp." Or an aristocrat. Or a narrow-minded bigot. Or a social butterfly. Or some other type of undesirable. Of course, *we* never have said these things; it must have been the other fellow. But if we even *think* these things about other institutions, our students will get the idea, and our alumni, and perhaps our field representatives. It is this feature of student recruiting that is comparatively new and wholly bad. It is against this feature of student recruiting that I raise my protest and my warning.

In earlier years, the emphasis was laid on going to college. Now the stress falls on the point, go to this particular college. It is a fatal change, because it lowers the activity of the recruiting agent from that of a professional man serving a cause to that of a commercial man promoting a particular institution. In my high school days, I do not recall ever having heard a college representative talk about his own college, although I remember many talks about the importance of going to college. But in these recent years when I have attempted to direct the affairs of a college, I have heard these comparisons made between colleges, and parents have occasionally tried to make me draw the comparisons for them. I refuse, because it is not my business to make the choice of college for other people's children. The business of the field representative is to make known the general advantages of college education and the facts about his own institution. The decision rests with the parents, or, perhaps I should more truly say today, with the students. But with the facts fairly presented to the student prospects and their parents, our duty is done. If next fall my college does not get its usual proportion of the entering freshman group on the basis of this kind of presentation

of its claims, then we must be content with the few that we get. We cannot embark on a campaign of high pressure salesmanship without leaving the professional field and descending to the arena of the market place. If this means death for a struggling college, then it is better that it die with honor, with its standards still held high, than that its extremity should be used by a promoting president to pull down the educational and ethical standards of an entire region.

What has caused the introduction of this new and unwise method of student recruiting? I think we can get at the explanation if we remember the type of students who were first solicited on the basis of awards and promises out of all keeping with their educational possibilities. That group was the high school athletes, the football stars. We have not yet awakened to the damage that was done to the American college when certain elements began to put pressure on college administrators to have great football teams. One element in that damage was that it transformed the attitude of the colleges to one another. Instead of being partners, the colleges became rivals, competing in a limited field, antagonistic. We wanted that young athlete and we did not want any other institution to get him. We wanted him, not because of what we could do for him, but because of what we thought he could do for us. So we heaped up our offers, our jobs, and our scholarships for these young giants of the grid-iron, until the attitude of the American college to the high school athlete has become a disgrace and a scandal and the athlete thinks nothing of asking, "How much am I offered?"

I think I can speak with some knowledge of what this kind of bidding and recruiting of athletes does in a small college, for I suppose no small college in America ever enjoyed greater football fame than Centre College had from 1919 to 1924. I was not at Centre at that time, but my judgment is based on the after-effects which I have seen in a presidency that began at Centre in 1927 and has lasted these nine years. My judgment is that the worst thing that ever happened in the long history of Centre College—and it has been an honorable history—was that famous victory of the Centre College Colonels over the Harvard eleven 6-0 in 1921. It threw things out of proportion. It upset the town's judgment of college values. It excited false hopes among alumni and encouraged unwise efforts on their part to get greater athletes and greater teams. The only thing that saved Centre College as a college was that this victory did not upset the faculty, and of the 134 freshmen attracted

by this victory the following fall, only 32 survived four years later to graduate. The *faculty* saved the institution from the consequences of a great football team. This is a story that I know, and it can be duplicated in almost every small college that has had a great football team. Better no football at all, I say, than football success that dwarfs in the popular mind and in certain alumni minds the educational activities of the institution and its social worth as a school.

Lest any of you may think that this disruptive condition prevails only on the campus of a small college, let me read you the curriculum arranged for athletes in one of the largest Southern universities:

After two years of the usual arts course, where I am informed, however, that the athletes are placed in special sections with special teachers, the star football man faces these courses for his junior and senior years:

First Semester, Junior Year:

Educational psychology	3 hours
Extra-curricular activity	2 hours
Physical education practice	2 hours
Health education	3 hours
Anatomy	3 hours
First aid	1 hour
Rhythms	1 hour
Elective	2 hours
<hr/>	
Total	17 hours

Second Semester, Junior Year:

Principles of high school teaching	3 hours
Physical education practice	2 hours
Physiology	3 hours
History and principles of physical education	3 hours
Playground and community recreation	2 hours
Rhythms	1 hour
Elective	3 hours
<hr/>	
Total	17 hours

First Semester, Senior Year:

Principles of secondary education	2 hours
Coaching major sports	2 hours
Materials and methods in minor field	2 hours
Electives which may be in part in physical education	8 hours
Directed observation and teaching	1½ hours
<hr/>	
Total	15½ hours

Second Semester, Senior Year:

Tests and measurements	2 hours
Coaching major sports	2 hours
Organization and administration of physical education	3 hours
Materials and methods in physical education	3 hours
Directed observation and teaching	1½ hours
Electives	5 hours
<hr/>	
Total	16½ hours

To these heights have our baccalaureate degrees now risen!!! Once I commented somewhat disparagingly on this surrender of the bachelor's degree to the limitations of athletic minds in the presence of the acting head of another institution, one of the greatest in the United States. Imagine my surprise and despair when he quietly responded to my indignation by saying, "We do it too."

I do not know where we are going with this thing. The fact is that a great many athletes ought not to be in college at all and remain in college by sufferance. If any one is disposed to question my pronouncements that many varsity athletes cannot carry the regular college load, I suggest that some candidate for a Ph.D. degree study the intelligence quotients of the athletes, their grades in certain favored classes (every school has them), their grades in other classes, and then publish the results with the names of the institutions. That doctor's dissertation for the first time in the history of such learned disputations would be a best seller within a week.

Let me repeat, then, that the first cause of this high pressure recruiting of students for a particular institution was the desire to have a great football team. It was an unworthy desire, and it led to unworthy activities. Many of the football players were men who had little or no scholastic ability, and the granting of scholarships to them was and is a travesty. I do not wish to be severe in my judgment of the intellectual abilities of athletes, for I have known a number who have had keen minds and a genuine intellectual interest. But the rule is as I have stated it, and I stand or fall by that judgment. There is no good educational reason for encouraging in a liberal arts college men who have not the slightest interest in culture and have no ability in learning. It is not fair to the men themselves; it is not fair to the other students; it is not fair to the institution. Possibly a great university may withstand the pressure on the educational program by segregating into special classes the football

stars who cannot do freshman college work; but the small colleges, in my judgment, cannot stand it. Their remedy must be the cessation of all recruiting of non-educational students, students not qualified to carry on the educational process beyond high school. And when that type of recruiting stops, there will be no more football teams in many of our small colleges—a consummation devoutly to be wished.

I have spent so much time in discussing the recruiting of athletes for a deliberate purpose. This topic is the one that educators habitually dodge. It must not be dodged any longer. The public is demanding great football teams and great athletic spectacles. I do not believe that it is the business of the college or even of the university to furnish these spectacles. We ought to get rid of this octopus and let the professional commercial agencies of the sporting world furnish the public with these gladiatorial shows. If our alumni tell us we shall ruin our institution, our reply must be, "*Per contra*, we are saving it." We are resuming our original role, the simple, single, dignified role of being a school. We are cutting off the accessories that have grown too great in order that we may drive forward to the completion of our central task. I do not say, discourage athletes. I simply say, let us stop recruiting them for educational institutions. If we quit recruiting them, they will not come.

My first proposition has been that the recruiting of students for a particular institution as against other institutions, by offers not in keeping with the student's capacity or the institution's ability to pay for the grant, began with the recruiting of football players. My second proposition is that such recruiting did not stop with the football players. From football we have advanced to basketball and track stars. And now we have gone over to the field of music; the good bandsman is not as valuable as the good half back but he has value. Debaters have been solicited, but debating has lost prestige. Perhaps the radio will bring a new rivalry for announcers, possibly also for crooners. The high school editor, the high school dramatic star, the Hi Y leader and the Girl Reserve president—each has a claim to present, and the college usually grants the claim.

Last January a young gentleman left Centre at the request of the faculty, his grades being below the standard set for readmission. He promptly appeared at another institution, and having registered, proceeded to the cashier's window to pay his fees. The young lady in charge asked him, "What kind of a scholarship do you have?"

He answered, "I do not have any scholarship." She said, "You must have a scholarship," but he being a young man of means answered, "No, I do not want a scholarship; I want to pay my bill." To which she gave this amazing answer, "You will have to take some kind of scholarship, because everybody who comes to this college has a scholarship." And that, I suppose, is the *ne plus ultra*, the *ultima thule*, the furthest north in the granting of scholarships.

The speed with which the granting of scholarships has been multiplied in recent years is alarming to those few remaining educators who believe that the student should pay a fair share of the total cost of his college education. That speed has been accelerated by certain well known factors that may be conveniently grouped under the head of our old friend general depression. One can easily see how a college president, from proper motives, might think it his duty to be exceedingly liberal in the granting of scholarships in a time of financial stringency. Was not the need among students greatly increased by the depression? Surely this factor contributed no little to the enlarged use of scholarships, and I have no word of censure for such increases as have been due to this consideration. It is true, however, that sometimes the need may not have been as great as was represented to the president, and thus unwittingly he may have asked the faculty to carry a burden that rightfully belonged on the shoulders of the parents.

Other grants, not based on the consideration of need, cannot be defended at all, though the reasons are clear enough. A college president finds that his income from endowment has shrunk, perhaps permanently. He finds that the sources of his gifts have dried up, perhaps permanently. He has debts to pay, payrolls to meet, faculty salaries to maintain, even on a starvation scale. In absolute desperation, the harassed president turns to the one remaining source of revenue, the students. If he can build up the student body in numbers, he will be saved. Every student he can draw within college halls means revenue. But other colleges in the same neighborhood are faced with the same necessity. Somebody begins to cut rates below the published tuition charges. Somebody else must retaliate. No one knows who started this vicious circle, but none can stop it. Every executive, every field representative knows that a college student paying \$50 in depression times, even though the tuition rate is \$200, is worth more than no student at all. And thus the old process that has cursed the business world, the old law of the jungle,

of dog eat dog, makes its way into the college world, and drags down the standards of the colleges below the level of fair dealing that honorable bankers and business men customarily employ.

Years ago I read with profound interest the remark of a great British thinker who had begun the study of economics and turned away from it with this statement, "I have read no further into the science of economics than to read that competition is the life of trade. That is a lie." Business has begun to see the falseness of a prosperity built on unrestrained competition. Can it be that the colleges will now take up the practice of lawless competition just at the time when business prepares to give it up? The children of Mammon are in their generation sometimes wiser than the children of light.

There is a remedy for the almost hopeless confusion that covers the whole field of student recruiting. It is not the simple remedy, "Do not do it." That would be Utopia, and no one wants to move there, particularly as some colleges might die there. Of course, college presidents and their field representatives are going to continue to approach prospective students, just as merchants will continue to advertise their wares. But we can make two fundamental changes in our approach to students, and these two changes will, in my judgment, solve the problem.

First, we can approach students on a *co-operative basis with other colleges*. Whether we join formally in an association of colleges within our own geographical area, as has been done in Ohio, or whether we continue to make our individual approaches, we can recognize that our field men are not so much the representatives of our own college as they are the representatives of the general cause and claims of higher education. Not all colleges will be willing to have their field representative take this position. Mr. Blackwell, of the University of Louisville, has told of an amusing experience he had when traveling for an Indiana college. He made his usual talk on college education before the high school students and in the audience was one of the trustees of the Indiana college. When he finished his talk, he said that the attitude of the trustee was a large question mark, "Why should Blank College be paying the salary of this man to make a general talk about education?" I had a similar experience in speaking at a church meeting in New York City, where an important alumnus listened in. He wrote back to a mutual friend in Danville, "He did not even mention Centre College." There was

no particular reason why I should have mentioned Centre on that occasion; and no reason why I should mention it in addressing high school students. Centre is only one of twenty-three colleges in Kentucky, six hundred in the nation. My interest is that these boys and girls in high school who have the capacity go on to *some* college, and every worthy college, if we play the game fairly, will secure its share.

Co-operation is the cure for certain bad phases of student recruiting, as it is the cure for so much that is wrong in our business and industrial world. Colleges ought to lead the way to these co-operative activities in the presentation of their cause, which is their common cause—education. I can hope even for the day when one representative may be employed by a group of colleges because of his understanding of the educational problems involved. A group of colleges now maintains a common office in the city of Chicago. Certainly the use of common pamphlets, joint advertisements, publicity material that is sponsored by a group of colleges, will be both economical and wise. We are all partners. We should act the part. If we compete, it is bound to be on the low level of trade, with the making of concessions that better business now abhors. Let us accept it rather as the basic principle on which we operate our colleges that we are each but one of many and that our primary interest is not in the preservation of a particular institution, but in the presentation of an educational opportunity which we, jointly with others, offer to the youth of our state.

The second change that we must make in our approach to students is this. We must approach students on a *co-operative basis with the students*. Our interest must be in them, not in our institutions. Our representatives must be qualified to act, not as advertisers, not as salesmen, but as counselors and guides. This means that we must pay salaries commensurate with the type and value of men who are qualified to advise. It means also that we have no place on our staff for those who are not qualified to advise. The development of many aptitude tests, and the growing skill in interpreting not alone the tests but the general habits and interests of students, will give to the competent field representative a more definite and, at the same time, a more extensive field of data on which his advice and judgment can be based. High school students, their parents and teachers, will welcome the coming of men representing the colleges who can counsel with them about the kind of college, if any, that

fits the need of the particular student; about the kind of occupation for which this student may have indicated a special talent. But we must send out experienced counselors, and not boosters.

I do not suggest that this business of student counseling will result in unfailingly wise decisions. No guidance in this changing world can be all-wise. But we know that so-called guidance based on the methods of commercial salesmanship is bound to be wrong. I suggest that we surrender a method that has nothing to commend it from the point of view of the student in favor of an approach that has in it at least the elements of scientific understanding and skilled technique. As I look back on my high school days, I think that I would have been helped greatly if some one had pointed out to me the now elementary differentiation of interests into those centering in people, those centering in ideas, and those centering in things, and the consequent professional or commercial aptitudes that such preferences may indicate. The colleges owe to the high school graduates that kind of guidance. We have not been giving it thus far, with a few honorable exceptions. Let us change from an outlook that sees in the high schools a happy hunting ground for new students, a field to exploit, and adopt an approach that regards the high school students as human beings on whom we have no special claims, but to whom we owe the fairest and best judgments that we can express. They constitute our field, not to exploit, but to serve.

DISCUSSION

BLAND L. STRADLEY

I am sure that you all agree that we have just listened to an important discussion of a pressing problem in higher education. I am no less sure that you will agree that President Turck has demonstrated a command of his subject which classifies him as a college administrator of wide range and high ideals. Too often during the past few years the subject of recruiting has been attacked by under-sized college administrators whose motives have not always been unselfish and whose knowledge of the implications of the topic has frequently left much to be desired. We are grateful to President Turck for his forthright discussion of a problem which is important to us all.

President Turck makes three points in his paper: first, that the present recruiting problem has grown from intercollegiate athletics;

second, that the answer to the problem of recruiting is co-operation among the colleges; and third, that so-called "recruiters" should be counselors rather than commercial salesmen.

The most important of these three is the second, i.e., that colleges should co-operate and not cut each other's throats. Anyone who would disagree with such a proposal would be short-sighted indeed. All through our society we need more co-operation, and the past few years have brought a larger degree of it than we have ever had before in our economic and political history. At the same time, however, the conclusion which grew on me, as I read President Turck's plea, was that his proposal is not practical. We all pay our respects to the idealist, but ideals that are not translatable into improved practice remain in the clouds of fancy.

So long as colleges pay recruiting officers salaries to bring in students, just so long will the recruiter recognize that his position depends upon his success. I know of an Ohio college, for example, which hired a recruiter for the first time two years ago. This fall he brought in fewer students than the President and the Board of Trustees thought he ought to, and the poor chap has been given notice that if he does not do better next year, he will lose his job. Now I submit that this is the most natural situation in the world. The recruiter is hired to perform, and when he does not someone else will be hired in his place. It is all very well to talk about co-operation, but there will never be co-operation, in my judgment, while we have recruiting agents who may say what they please without the possibility of being checked up by objective facts.

Co-operation is desirable, of course, if we can get it, but we shall never get it, I am convinced, until these objective facts are available to anyone who wants them and indeed until they are commonly distributed to parents of prospective students and to prospective students themselves. It is at this point that the colleges can co-operate. The North Central Association is asserting national leadership in reorganizing the criteria of accreditation. The new data developing from the application of these criteria should be made available to all interested individuals. More than that, their availability should be publicized so that every parent of a high school student who plans to send his son or daughter to a college may know that there is some disinterested organization to which he may go for honest objective facts about the colleges which he is considering. This, it seems to me, is the sort of co-operation we need. We shall

never solve the recruiting problem by proposing that the men and women who earn their bread and butter by recruiting students should conduct themselves more ethically. All pleas to such an end seem to me to be vain hopes of Utopia.

President Turck has mentioned the co-operative plan instituted recently by the colleges of Ohio. In time perhaps the Ohio program will be effective. I doubt that anyone will say that it is now. I recently heard, for example, of one student who has received fifty-six catalogues from Ohio colleges during a period of two months. This almost amusing situation developed after the Ohio colleges had agreed to collect data in common and to make it available to anyone. It must be said, of course, that the plan in Ohio is new and that the situation may improve in the future. That remains to be seen. We must not judge what is being done too hastily. It is still in the experimental stage. I believe strongly, however, that it is too much to hope that the colleges will be willing to co-operate with one another as extensively as President Turck proposes.

Turning to the first of President Turck's points, i.e., that athletic recruiting is responsible for the general recruiting situation, I doubt that this is historically true. The first game of football was played between Rutgers and Princeton in 1869. If I have read my history of higher education correctly, recruiting existed much before that date. Indeed, the clergymen of New England and the Eastern States in general notoriously recruited students for their colleges even in the seventeenth century. They were the examiners for the colleges, and acting in such capacities they exerted considerable influence in directing students to the institutions from which they had graduated. There is evidence to indicate that frequently they were more interested in having students go to the institutions which they knew than to the college best suited for each individual.

I mention this fact—and I consider it to be a fact—merely to indicate that we can over-simplify this problem of recruiting. It has been with us since the beginning of the American college, and it will remain with us until we recognize that some agency above the colleges must be responsible for furnishing objective information about every institution in which a student is interested. Undoubtedly the recruiting of athletics had much to do with stimulating the recent boom development, but this influence is not so important, it seems to me, as President Turck suggests. By placing too much significance upon it, we are likely, I would say, to overlook the com-

plexities of the problem. More than that, we are likely to fail to see clearly the need of the objective information which seems to me to be so important.

As for the third point, i.e., that recruiters should be counselors, that seems to me to be splendid. To be a good counselor, however, one must be disinterested. Counseling involves the give and take between two individuals, one of whom is qualified to help the other. It does not mean persuasion and high pressure selling. So long as recruiters are out to meet a quota, they will seek to "sell" students the idea that they should enter the college they represent. It is too much to hope that they will counsel with them about where best they should matriculate. If counseling is to be done, it must be done, in my judgment, by individuals who have no institutional ties and who seek to see the student as an individual. Such counselors would direct each high school graduate to the college which is best able to serve his needs.

In discussing this point, President Turck has referred to "Johnny going to college." He has pointed out that powerful influences are at work in our society which direct many students to colleges who ought not to matriculate. He points out that it has become both fashionable and profitable for Johnny to become a college man even though, it should be added, he may not stay more than a few months. This situation, of course, has unfortunate implications. Thousands of Johnnies are guarantying large entering classes for most colleges these days, but where, I am impelled to query, does Johnny come off? We flunk him out in great numbers. In just as great numbers we fail to meet his needs. Why should not we be frank with Johnny and point out to him his possibilities of college success even though it may mean that we shall have fewer tuitions and fewer sources of miscellaneous income that come from student registrations?

A scandalously few of our institutions in America have been frank with their prospective students even though it is alleged that some guarantee satisfaction. You have perhaps heard of the anxious parent who sought an interview with the late Woodrow Wilson during his presidency at Princeton. In response to the anxious mother's inquiry concerning her son, Mr. Wilson observed that at Princeton they guarantee satisfaction or return the boy. I think we may reasonably query whether or not many boys and girls are not returned to their parents unceremoniously and often too hastily,

even though a few months previously their enrolments were so tenderly sought.

I return again then to my point that we shall never solve the recruiting problem until college representatives are supplemented by other agencies who have no axes to grind. If the colleges are serious in their belief that the recruiting evil should be eradicated, they will set to work to establish such agencies. Interested colleges and universities may co-operate best by helping finance such organizations. By all means let us have co-operation and this seems to me the place to start.

Incidentally, may I protest against the use of the word "recruiter"? It is a most unfortunate word. In my thinking at least, it is in the same category as such words as "racketeer" and "chiseler." Moreover, it has a military connotation. It seems to me that we ought to abandon it and to substitute "enrolment officer" or "selections officer." I make this suggestion even though President Roosevelt in his recent address at Temple University seemed, by implication at least, to approve of recruiting practices.

Of course, any new designation will be a euphemism until we establish an honest-to-goodness co-operative plan. I believe strongly, however, that co-operation toward making our present recruiting officers behave is not the answer. We can not make them behave. Of that I am convinced. We can, however, make information about every college available to the public. This, as President Turk suggests, may mean that the poorer institutions will have to die. Many informed laymen and educators agree that this might be a development for the improvement of higher education.

Social Forces Affecting College Entrance

ROY W. BIXLER

The past thirty years have seen a great popularization of secondary education. High school enrolments have increased more than eight hundred per cent in that period, and college enrolments have increased more than four hundred per cent. The number of high school graduates entering college was more than doubled between 1920 and 1929, although the proportion of high school graduates entering college did not increase in that period.¹

The early stages of the movement, previous to 1920, placed such a heavy demand upon the colleges that they were forced to make the admission of students more selective. The first institutions to limit enrolments by selective processes were Eastern colleges in which increasing enrolments had been compelling enlargement of facilities from year to year. Selective admissions began in earnest about 1919. For twenty or twenty-five years previous to this date, there had been fairly constant annual increases in total college enrolments of from one to three per cent.²

After more than fifteen years of increasing emphasis on selective admissions, the attitude toward selectivity seems to be changing. Formerly we were asking, "Whom shall we admit?" Now the question is, "Whom can we get?" The anxiety over enrolments is not limited entirely to the weaker colleges that are struggling for existence on account of waning resources, although they seem to be taking the lead in recruiting activities. Some of the large state universities are not unconcerned over enrolments and have their devices to attract students who might go to other colleges in the state, or to colleges outside of the state; and even strong private universities have been accused of engaging in *dignified* publicity with their elaborate and expensive brochures, college days, traveling movies, etc., not to mention their winning football teams and their great football stars.

No doubt the depression has made the problem of college enrolments more acute, but the depression is not entirely responsible. There are deeper causes which should be evaluated and considered

¹ *Biennial Survey of Education* (1928-30), Vol. II, Office of Education Bulletin (1931), No. 20, pp. 6-7.

² Hopkins, L. B., "Personnel Procedure in Education," *Educational Record Supplement*, No. 3 (October, 1926).

in formulating admissions policies. It is conceivable that the forces which compelled colleges, in defense of standards, to institute selective admissions, are being replaced by new forces operating in reverse, and that the practice of selective admissions, adopted as a *practical* device and later supported and justified by an applied educational philosophy, may no longer be practical. (It would be interesting to see how long it would stand upon educational philosophy if it should cease to be practical.)

Let us examine some of the deeper causes of the present anxiety over college enrolments—causes which have been classified by students of social movements as definite social trends and which, as such, will probably continue to affect enrolments—and let us try to see how these trends may be related to the admissions problems of the future.³

Population trends.—We are approaching a stationary population. Before the Civil War the population of the United States increased at the rate of thirty-five per cent every ten years. Between 1920 and 1930 the increase was only sixteen per cent. There are also certain trends in the distribution of the population.

The population trend most significant for education, and most directly related to the problem of college entrance, is the changing proportion of old and young people. In a hundred years the median age of the population has increased from 16.7 years to 26.4 years. From 1920 to 1930 the number of persons between the ages of 45 and 65 increased one-fourth and those between the ages 65 and 75 increased one-third. Also, in 1930, for the first time in the United States, there were fewer children under ten years of age than in the preceding census. Already there are not enough children in some cities to occupy all of the desks in earlier grades. Provost Rufus D. Smith, of New York University, who has made a study⁴ of population trends and their effect on education, thinks that high school enrolments will pass their peak in 1937 and begin to decline soon thereafter, and that the decline will affect the colleges by 1941.

An increasing birth rate in the nineteenth century and restriction of immigration have been given as the chief causes of the increase in the proportion of old people, and a rapid decline of the birth rate since 1924 is the principle cause of the declining number of young children. There are no indications that these trends will be checked

³ Unless other works are cited, *Recent Social Trends in the United States* (Report of the Hoover Research Committee on Social Trends) is the source of the specific data on social trends as discussed herein.

⁴ *New York Journal of Educational Psychology*, April, 1936.

in the future, so the median age of the population may be expected to continue to rise. In fact, this trend will be magnified as the medical profession makes progress in its increasing attention to the diseases of old age.

The declining proportion of children will be offset, to some extent, in the elementary and high schools, by an increase in the proportion of children of school age in school, but any great increase in the proportion of those of college age attending college will be difficult to achieve because of the high cost of education on this level. It has already been shown that the proportion of high school graduates attending college remained stationary between 1920 and 1929. It appears, therefore, that the colleges will have to depend for increases in enrolments upon a continuation of the popularization of secondary education unless new sources of students, or of financial support of education for the indigent, or both, can be found. Further popularization of secondary education cannot fail to have the effect of lowering the average scholastic aptitude of the high school graduate, and, consequently, of lowering the average ability of college entrants unless there is renewed emphasis on selectivity in admissions.

Technological progress and the need for adult education.—Another force that should be considered in the formulation of admissions policies of the future is the responsibility of education in the social adjustments to technological unemployment. The rapid substitution of machines for men in industry increases the number of unemployed, especially of older people, and, if the shorter working week is adopted, will increase the leisure time of the employed. We are acquainted with the argument that technological progress does not create unemployment but rather creates new opportunities for employment as new industries are established, the automobile industry being the best example of this effect. But men have to be trained to adjust to new work opportunities and to occupy the places offered in new industries. Furthermore, geographical redistribution of labor has to be effected. All of these things take time and at least temporary unemployment results.

Education should assume some responsibility for easing the effect of employment dislocation caused by technological progress. Periods of unemployment should be utilized for adult education and re-education. The man out of a job has experienced a shock. He needs rehabilitation.

Furthermore, whether or not there is technological unemploy-

ment, there is need for an adult education program. In this need there is an opportunity for the colleges to extend their services and thereby tap a great new source of students. There is a marked tendency for older members of the community to seek educational opportunities for the use of their leisure time. Night school attendance almost doubled between 1918 and 1930, and in 1934 there were more than 1,000 non-commercial adult education agencies important enough to be mentioned in the Adult Education Handbook of the American Association for Adult Education, but, with the one exception of the national agricultural extension system, there is no integrated program, and none of the philanthropists or foundations have invested any millions in it.

The increasing proportion of adults in the population, the increasing amount of leisure time, and the tendency of adults to utilize leisure time in educational activities therefore provide a promising source of students if the colleges will make the adjustments necessary to provide the educational opportunities desired by this group.

Progress of transportation and communication.—The improvement of transportation is a part of technological progress, but its effect on the enrolments of the small colleges is so great that it deserves to be discussed under a separate head. Most colleges were established in the horse and buggy days or earlier. Many saw their first students arrive on foot out of the forests. There were eighteen colleges in Ohio in 1850, and Ohio University was then forty-six years old. There was no proselyting among these eighteen colleges in 1850. But the railroads soon tapped new areas, and along came the automobile. Commuting distances lengthened from five to fifty miles and spheres of influence of colleges spread over even greater areas. Now, the radio has given educational institutions an instrument by which they can extend their spheres of influence almost without limit, and many are using it. With the handicap of distance almost removed for communication and greatly reduced for transportation, students are free to choose a college almost without consideration of these factors. Consequently, the colleges are stepping on each other at every turn. It is no wonder that great friction is developing in their campaigns for students.

The simple fact is that there are now too many colleges. Ohio may be used again as an example, for no reason other than that it is typical. If each of the forty colleges listed in the *College Bluebook* is made the center of a circle drawn within a fifty-mile radius, on the

arbitrary assumption, for purposes of illustration, that each college is entitled to a sphere of influence of that size, tremendous overlapping is discovered. The smallest amount of overlapping is found in the case of Marietta College, whose territory overlaps that of only seven other institutions. The number of colleges within these illustrative spheres of influence ranges from two to eight, with an average of six.

The colleges have been slow to make adjustments to this type of competition and, as a result, more than a hundred have closed their doors in the last ten years. A few have been wise enough to prolong their existence by mergers. Since 1928, at least forty denominational colleges have entered into mergers.⁵ In two of these mergers, systems of colleges have been organized. In Mississippi, Millsaps College, Whitworth College, and Grenada College have joined to form the Millsaps-Whitworth Collegiate System. In Arkansas, Hendrix College, Henderson-Brown College, and Galloway Woman's College have joined to form the Trinity System of Colleges. In 1934 six colleges crossed state lines in mergers. Broadview College in Illinois joined Emmanuel Missionary College in Michigan; Tabor College in Iowa joined Doane College in Nebraska; and Central Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church in Ohio merged with Eden Theological Seminary in Missouri. These voluntary consolidations represent intelligent adjustments, but the troublesome element of competition for students will not be removed until there are many more extinct colleges, many more reorganized and consolidated colleges, and more co-operative plans, reducing duplication of educational effort.

A changing attitude toward religion.—Another trend that tends to reduce enrolments in the denominational colleges, especially, is a changing attitude toward religion; more especially, a changing attitude toward denominationalism. There was a time when the denominational colleges could depend upon a rather constant influx of students who would enrol because of denominational loyalties; and they could depend upon the churches of the denomination to make up deficits. But the churches are also feeling the effects of social trends, one of which is this declining interest in religion. This trend has been revealed objectively by a study of public interests and

⁵ Coffman, Lotus D., "The New Situation in Education," and Greenleaf, Walter J., "Colleges in 1935," *Journal of Higher Education*, VI, 3, (March, 1935), pp. 118, 127-31 respectively.

opinions reflected in leading magazines and allied sources since 1900, and by a study of the proportion of books and articles published on religious subjects. The magazines read by the masses of the people reflect little more than a growing lack of interest in religion, but a growing critical attitude has been observed in the magazines read by the intelligentsia.

The Administrative Director of the School of Religion of the University of Iowa says⁶ that there are many evidences that students are not interested in an exclusive denominationalism, or in any narrow interpretation of religion, and asserts that it is his impression that there is an increasing ignorance of the literature and historical records of religion, especially the Bible and the History of the Christian Church, and that there is a wide-spread attitude that the past in religion, as in other fields, has little to contribute to the solution of our present problems.

This report of student attitude toward religion reinforces the findings of the Hoover Committee. If there is a declining interest in religion, which seems highly probable, it is a force that must be reckoned with by the denominational colleges in building or revising their policies affecting college entrance.

Growth of the junior college.—Perhaps the most significant development affecting the distribution of college enrolment is the growth of the junior college. The upward extension of secondary education, accomplished by the junior college, and the establishment of professional education on the senior college level threaten to destroy the liberal arts college. The idea that general or liberal education is the function of the junior college is becoming well established, and professional education is rapidly becoming allocated as a function of the university. This leaves the liberal arts college in a dilemma. Continuation in the field of general education logically demands reorganization as a junior college, and the introduction of professional training alters its fundamental function.

Some of the friends of the liberal arts college profess to believe that the junior college is not a serious competitor of the four-year college because in the thirty years of its life it has not developed a soul, but, soul or no soul, it continues to advance. The 1935 Directory of the Office of Education lists 448 junior colleges and 644

⁶ Lampe, M. Willard, "Facts and Impressions Concerning the Present Status of Religion Among Students," *Bulletin of the Association of American Colleges*, XXI, 3 (November, 1935), p. 459.

degree granting colleges and universities. In 1917 there were only 132 junior colleges. Enrolments in junior colleges increased from 16,121 in 1922 to 122,514 in 1935. They increased 13.5 per cent in 1934-35.⁷ If there had been no junior colleges in 1935 and the students enroled in junior colleges that year had been distributed equally among the 644 degree conferring institutions, each would have had an increase in enrolment of 190 students.

In all probability, the best way out of the dilemma for many of the weaker colleges would be to reorganize as two-year or four-year junior colleges. The fact that private junior colleges had a twenty per cent⁸ increase in 1935 might well encourage some of the liberal arts colleges to carry out this type of reorganization.

I have mentioned five social forces that tend to affect college entrance, namely, population trends, technological progress, progress in transportation and communication, the changing attitude toward religion, and the growth of the junior colleges. Of these five forces, only one—population trends—threatens actually to reduce the number of students available for college entrance, and this possible reduction need not be regarded with apprehension if appropriate opportunities for adult education are provided. Technological progress will co-operate by providing an increasing number of adults with leisure time and inclination to use it in the pursuit of education.

Progress in transportation and communication, the changing attitude toward religion, and the growth of the junior college affect only the distribution of college students, and these forces all tend to reduce the enrolments of the smaller liberal arts colleges. Better transportation and communication encourage students who can afford it to take advantage of the educational opportunities provided by the large universities in the centers of population; the junior college is providing a good and economical general education for those who cannot afford to go to the large universities; and the changing attitude toward denominationalism in religion reduces the power of the denominational college to attract and hold these groups. So, these three forces are interacting to squeeze out the small liberal arts colleges, especially the denominational colleges. The result is a last struggle for survival which is characterized by very

⁷ Eels, W. C., "Status of the Junior College in the United States in 1935-36," *School and Society*, Vol. 43, No. 1101 (February 1, 1936), pp. 160-62.

⁸ *Ibid.*

undignified and, in some cases, unethical practices in the competition for students.

The colleges in general deplore the situation, but feel that it is a matter of self-defense. Extensive discussion of the problem is developing which will eventually lead to alleviating action. One sectional group of colleges has already entered into an agreement to limit financial aid to freshmen and to demand repayment of scholarships in the event of transfer to another institution. A state group has written a code to govern recruiting. Such measures will have the effect of a sedative, but they will not get at the causes of the disease which are deeply rooted in the powerful forces already mentioned. The cure will come in the form of an adaptive reorganization of education which takes these forces into consideration.

The Distribution of Marks

C. S. YOAKUM

Some encouragement comes from time to time to the propagandist. Observing the ease with which educational fads rise, spread, and fall, it seems strange that certain proposals with respect to students' marks have not been accepted long since. Proposals made years ago in this field have not yet produced wide appeal. In the meantime, many other educational fads have appeared and disappeared. In 1906, for example, I made a study of marks given high school students in the University High School at the University of Chicago. My familiarity with the bell shaped curve at that time was slight and perhaps has not improved much meanwhile. Nevertheless, I proposed that such a curve take the place of the bimodal curve then exhibited by the distribution of marks in the University High School.

The bimodal curve that I found was due apparently to the teachers' inability or reluctance to distinguish among those who received marks near the point that custom then decreed was failure; thus, a wide range of marks was pushed together just above this point. Presumably there is a place in the accumulation of bits of knowledge or whatever is tested by examinations where it becomes more and more difficult to go on, so difficult perhaps that teacher and pupil both quit trying. Doubtless these teachers whose marks distributed themselves bimodally found many of those students who fell near or below "passing" capable of getting knowledge from succeeding courses.

The encouragement mentioned is found in a proposal of the College Entrance Examination Board dated March 5, 1936. I quote: "The College Entrance Examination Board has under consideration a new method of reporting the results of its examinations. In the opinion of the Committee of Revision, the scale on which the grades are now reported—0 to 100 scale in steps of five—is not entirely satisfactory." Please note the use of the word "new" in the quotation, since, as I shall quote later, the bell shaped distribution curve is the basis of the "new" proposal. The proposal of the Board is encouraging. It cuts deep into the traditions that have grown up around the various marking systems. Pleasantest of all, it is a personal encouragement, for I have actually lived long enough

to see a board that passes out thousands of marks each year propose to recognize at least one set of the facts.

One of the traditions the Board seeks to destroy is the "passing mark." To quote once more from the proposal:

The Committee of Revision recommends that the Board consider the possibility of discontinuing the reporting of grades on the percentage scale from 0 to 100 which has given rise to the fictitious and fallacious passing mark of 60 in the minds of teachers, parents, and pupils, and, instead, of reporting grades on the now widely accepted scale used for the Scholastic Aptitude test which fixes the grade of the average college applicant at 500, distributes the scores so that they range from approximately 200 to approximately 800, and yields a continuous scale, any point on which may be referred to the percentage of the random college applicant population falling above and below it.

Of course, 60 which the Board has fixed in the "minds of teachers, parents, and pupils" is no more "fictitious and fallacious" than any other "passing mark" that could be and has been selected. The pride with which a college or school announces that its "passing mark" is 75 is born of the same fallacy. "Our passing mark was once 65 but is now 70" employs the same fiction. What is the fallacy that arises?

The fallacy is compounded. In the first place, it carries the assumption that the grading process reaches a high degree of accuracy at 60 or whatever mark is set as passing. The University High School referred to above avoided this error. The teachers realized that they could not determine precisely when a student was able to go on and when he was not; hence the mode in the curve at the point tradition set. Moreover, where the next course in the subject starts determines the significance of the mark in the previous course. The student whose mark is 60 may improve far more in a succeeding course than the one whose earlier mark was 90. A student who accumulates low passing marks may be and frequently is advised to attend another college where he is expected to and often does earn much better marks. The fallacy lies in identifying the student with his marks and overlooking such matters as inaccuracy in grading, repetition of subject matter in successive courses, ability of teachers, and differing standards in different colleges.

A respectable series of articles, some of quite recent date, point out the surprising fact that students pass general ability tests better today than in earlier years. In a few instances actual subject matter testing shows that the class of students applying for admission and being accepted are better prepared than they were previously. Data

of this type are perhaps subject to considerable suspicion. However, Rundquist made a careful study¹ in which he showed "that there has been an increase in the intelligence level of Minneapolis high school seniors between 1929 and 1933." He found also that there had been a definite tendency for school marks to show a downward trend. Palmer, in a large Philadelphia high school, relates² this to the apparent fact that the bright boys who were enticed into business must now stay in school. He also points out the importance of emotional maladjustment as a factor in reducing the subject matter standing of such boys and thus reducing that of the entire group.

Many factors are doubtless involved. Our thesis, here, however, concerns the fiction of the passing mark and hence of all marks. A record of twelve years in a college with a relatively stable clientele is available. A smooth curve of the percentage of students entering from the upper quarter of their graduating class shows a gradual increase in that percentage from 36 to 56. Similarly, the selection shows that of all students admitted approximately 65 per cent came from the upper half of their high school classes in the earlier years; but in the later years this percentage increased to 90. During this period the percentage of students who "passed" rose from 87 to 90. The "passing" mark thus bore no significant relationship to the process of selection.

The stability of the percentage of marks of any one kind is remarkable. In the college just referred to the percentage of A's ranged over a five-year period from 11.2 to 12.8 with an average variation of 0.6 of 1 per cent. The percentage of A's and B's ranged from 39.3 to 41.4 over the same period. At the University of Michigan in the college, the average percentage of A's over a six-year period, five of which coincide with the five of the other college, was 11.7. The average for the first college was 11.8. The difference between averages on the same general ability test for the students of the two colleges is a significant difference for each year. The conclusion seems patent. Marks are faculty habits.

Unfortunately they are representative of habits and traditions of the faculty only in the aggregate. The marks of colleges compare favorably when these marks are grouped in large numbers. Members

¹ Rundquist, E. A., "Intelligence Test Scores and School Marks of High School Seniors in 1929 and 1933," *School and Society*, Vol. 43, No. 1105 (February, 1936), p. 301.

² Palmer, C. W., "Higher I. Q. and Lower A. Q.," *School and Society*, Vol. 43, No. 1110 (April 4, 1936), p. 469.

of faculties and even entire departments exhibit idiosyncrasies that disappear when summed into a single curve. The variability of the marking habits of individual faculty members is too great to exhibit as an illustration in a short paper. No single purpose or standard is represented.

In large departments it might be expected that the general faculty traditions could be demonstrated. On the contrary large shifts in practice are again discoverable. For eight years the average grade of the students in English 1 moved fairly evenly upward from point 1.16 (slightly above C) to point 1.28. The ninth year the average grade suddenly dropped to point 0.92. It rose during the tenth year to point 1.02. In mathematics the freshmen in a certain college struggled along for several years at approximately point 0.82, then to quote the statistician reporting the figures, "The average grade in mathematics dropped out of sight." This proved too much even for a faculty accustomed to condone such departmental peculiarities. Changes in the staff were made and mathematics began to conform once more. It proved to be a long struggle, for five years later the average grade had climbed only to point 0.98, still under C. For three or four years zoology sideslipped steadily, failed to maintain altitude and suddenly went into a tailspin. By skillful piloting, a wreck similar to that of mathematics was averted and from a low point, 0.70, climbed steadily back to the original altitude of eight years earlier.

Recall now that while these unfortunate episodes were taking place (and they were not limited to these subjects) the average grade of all these freshmen ranged between point 1.10 and point 1.24 and the total percentages of A's given varied within the period less than one per cent. At the University of Michigan where almost exactly the same general situation existed, the departmental differences in a single year ranged from 5.6 per cent A's to 24.3 per cent A's.

Out of this array of variations, it is difficult to find what the individual student does. It is clear that the sort of marks obtained when the same examination is given in different colleges does not represent this faculty habit. Students do differ, even though the sum of marks for the several letter grades given in different colleges bear closely similar percentage relationships. Two lines of evidence are open to us: average grades and common examinations reliably scored.

The "average grades" method makes a number of rather dubious assumptions if used separately. Nevertheless, we can take the marks made by each individual, obtain the average of these by any of the common procedures in use, and determine a distribution of the achievement or ability of students from these averages. We may, for example, assume $A=3$, $B=2$, $C=1$, $D=0$, $E=-1$, or $A=4$, $B=3$, $C=2$, $D=1$, and $E \text{ etc.}=0$. We proceed then to average each student's marks and find his average grade. The average grades thus determined for the freshmen at the University of Michigan for a single year distribute themselves as follows: $E \text{ etc.}=2.8$ per cent; $D=26.7$ per cent; $C=45.2$ per cent; $B=21.0$ per cent; $A=4.4$ per cent. A symmetrical curve of the Gaussian type with its base line divided into five equal parts might find its area divided somewhat as follows: 3.5 per cent; 23.8 per cent; 45 per cent; 23.8 per cent; and 3.5 per cent. The College Entrance Board proposes a division of 12 equal intervals on the base line. Reduced to five the percentages would be 2.3, 28.7, 38.0, 28.7, and 2.3. The choice of their distribution is based on the usage developed through experience with the Scholastic Aptitude Test.

We find then that "students" tend to distribute themselves symmetrically about a mean. Marks on the other hand even when combined in large numbers produce non-symmetrical distributions. Obviously, marks summed from the variations of faculty traditions produce a spurious regularity. Part of this fiction can be exposed by summing for each individual student. All of it can be removed—the fiction, not the irregularities—by giving examinations wherein the readers can "sense accurately the differences in the performance of the individual candidates."

Two approaches have been made to carry out this last principle. The first endeavors to write an examination which will state the questions and problems unequivocally. Such an attempt involves clarity in formulation, sufficient background on the part of the student to give him an understanding of the language and method of the examiner, and a similar understanding on the part of the readers. This ideal seems unattainable at present, although notable steps have been taken. The second attempt assumes *in addition* that students do not carry away from a subject precisely the same facts, laws, principles, and powers and, therefore, it undertakes to sample extensively the students' behavior. This has been in part the province of the so-called "short answer" form of examination.

I presume that by this time you realize one must inevitably come to the following conclusion: The only all A group of students is the group that contains but one student. Such a conclusion, while logically permissible, has naturally no practical significance in dealing with classes or groups of students. Fineness and accuracy of scaling will seldom reach that degree which places each student in a class by himself. What it does do, however, is to eliminate the *passing mark* as a criterion of anything having to do with a particular examination. As a matter of fact, actual practice among admission officers exemplifies this principle on an even larger scale. Our admission requirements are set forth according to college habits in similar terms. In Michigan our higher educational institutions use almost the same words. Notwithstanding, the intellectual ability and educational achievement of those students accepted by the several institutions differ widely.

The theme of this discussion is limited. Examination results are the product of many factors. Examinations are set for a variety of purposes, not all of which are amenable to scaling methods. The discussion of distribution, which has been the theme here, rests on the assumption that we are seeking measures of ability or achievement. With this objective in mind Crawford laid down³ three principles: "(1) that the performance of a representative group sets the most logical standard of scholastic achievement; (2) that any individual's mark should properly represent relative achievement within a group; and (3) that equal relative achievement, as thus judged, should receive equal credit, whether in the same or different subjects of study."

To recapitulate: The "passing mark" is a fallacy because it assumes too much. It discriminates too strongly. It is dependent upon the frailty of examination procedures, the predilections of readers of question papers, the belief that courses are strictly sequentially arranged, and the notion that the values of a course to a student are found within a limited range of performance. The "passing mark" is a fiction because it is based on college customs and traditions and on faculty habits and idiosyncrasies and bears no relation to the distribution of ability or achievement of the students themselves. The most stable factor in any group is its average performance. Its use avoids the "absolute pitch" theory of grading papers. Hard and

³ Crawford, A. B., "Rubber Micrometers," *School and Society*, Vol. 32 (August 16, 1930), p. 233.

easy examinations within reasonable limits can be reconciled. It offers an opportunity to measure achievement in a subject over a wide range. It permits the scaling of marks according to the most probable distribution of ability or achievement. Combine the use of the average with a measure of dispersion and the first step will be taken to make students' marks reflect the behavior of students themselves.

I urge you then to encourage the Board in putting into effect its "Proposed New Scale for the Examination Ratings of the College Entrance Examination Board," and commend the pamphlet for your rereading.

The National Youth Administration and the Student

RICHARD R. BROWN

In the prosperous twenties the "earn your way through college" tradition was firmly embedded in the strata of American life. Stories of the Horatio Alger type, with the hero earning a college education by selling automobiles or by working as a waiter in a lunchroom, were avidly read by a large public. Nor did the educational authorities themselves doubt the value of this tradition but rather encouraged it and spread the gospel abroad. "Unquestionably," a dean of a large Eastern college stated recently, "the tremendous increase in college registration during the post-war decade was due, more than to any other cause, to the wide-spread belief that any one of average ability and health, could, indeed should, earn a college education. . . ." The fact was that this belief or tradition stemmed and gained strength from two more fundamental and peculiarly American traditions—first, that hard work and thrift were not only the highest virtues but were the inevitable concomitants to success; and, second, that regardless of one's interests or aptitudes and no matter how great the sacrifice, it was to the good of all people, especially in a democracy, to acquire the greatest possible amount of education.

In the last five or six years these traditions have been seriously shaken. With the depression has come not only the drying up of funds from private resources so that scholarships are no longer as numerous and as large as they once were, but also the unemployment situation, too, has made it virtually impossible for young people to earn enough money to meet the total expenses of a college education. As the number of students seeking part-time jobs with which to keep themselves in college has increased, the available number of these jobs has decreased. The full effect of this trend was not felt, however, until 1932, for between 1930 and 1932 it was counteracted, as the increase in college registrations by four per cent indicated, by the tendency of young people, no matter how well qualified, to go to college and thus postpone their entrance into an already overcrowded labor market. But from 1932 to 1934 college registrations fell off by ten per cent, and it was this alarming situation which led in February, 1934, to the inauguration by the federal government

of a college aid program. The problem of earning one's way through college had become acute.

It was then that doubts, particularly as to the value of working for an education and its effect on the student, began to crop up. Were potentially good students, it was asked, being handicapped, if not wholly lost sight of, because of the amount of outside work they were compelled to do? How many students were really capable of obtaining any great benefits from a college education? Was it, after all, worth the sacrifice and the efforts that were being made to help a large number of the students who were attempting to be self-supporting? And what effect was the increasing numbers of self-supporting students having not only on the academic but also on the extra-curricula life of the college? Indeed, in 1932, a group of personnel officers from certain Eastern colleges were stirred to discover the answers to these and similar questions.

The conclusions of this group are startling and interesting since they represent probably the first systematic attempt to analyze a tradition which for too long a time had been accepted at its face value. It was their opinion that:

First, the health hazards involved in combining a full collegiate program with sufficient outside employment to provide full support are most serious.

Second, constant worry over financial matters and excessive time devoted to self-support produce a demoralizing effect on the student's scholastic achievement, general adjustment and social contacts.

Third, the more numerous the self-supporting students, the thinner the available means of assistance must be spread.

Fourth, an excessive number of self-supporting students renders the competition for jobs so keen that employers are able to take advantage of students.

Fifth, a disproportionately large number of self-supporting students, being in a sense part-time students, tends to turn the college into a part-time institution.

Sixth, a too large proportion of self-supporting students jeopardizes the extra-curricular and social life of the institution.

The full truth of some of these conclusions I am somewhat inclined to question. Though it is doubtless true on the whole that the health hazards of over-work are most serious and that constant worry over financial matters can be demoralizing, this does not prove the assertion of President Conant, of Harvard University, that working one's way through college is more destructive than productive. It simply gives added testimony to the wisdom of that old, old adage that nothing should be carried to excess. Perhaps in

some cases it is unavoidable that, in order to earn enough money and to keep up in their courses, students must do an excessive amount of work. Nevertheless, it seems to me that Dean McKnight, of Columbia College, is correct in his statement that "the harm lies not so much in part-time work in itself as in the amount permitted and the unsystematic fashion in which the various forms of student aid, including employment, are assigned." Students who might do part-time work without undue strain are sometimes given scholarships. Others who are temporarily embarrassed by financial affairs find themselves forced to over-work when they might have been aided by a loan. These are, in other words, matters which require little more than better planning and more individual treatment to be remedied. Where it is within the power of the college, as in the case of federal student aid, a further solution, it is suggested, lies in the shortening of the hours of work and in the raising of the rates of pay, so that, though earning the same amount of money during the school year, students will have to work a fewer number of hours.

Another solution offered, with which, however, I am in little sympathy, is the elimination of those young men and women whose capabilities and interests do not qualify them for a college education. If this were done, it would no longer be necessary to spread so thin the available means of assistance over a large number of students. It would mean, too, a lessening in the competition for jobs and a consequent lessening of the employers' power over the student. The problem here, of course, is to find a wise and fair standard which can be applied in making the selection of those who should, and of those who should not, be encouraged to remain in college. And in so far as a solution lies along this line, it puts a great responsibility upon those who administer student aid activities. But before anything of this sort is done, it seems to me, a study should be made of the alternatives in other fields that could be offered to those young people whose applications for assistance are turned down. Little justification could be found for a policy which, to make it easier for potentially good students, forced into the ranks of the unemployed young people, who, though not particularly benefiting from a college education, were nevertheless getting by in their studies.

The objection that part-time work interferes with the extra-curricular and social life of a college is to my mind the least serious objection of the lot. Valuable as these outside college activities may be, they are not of sufficient importance to warrant giving up

the theory of self-support. Though the proportion of self-supporting students is undoubtedly large, nevertheless the majority, which should be a sufficient number, of students are able to engage wholeheartedly in such activities. Nor will it be necessary, if it is possible to cut down on the length of the part-time work, for students to refrain altogether from participating in the social and athletic life of the college. After making a survey of students receiving federal aid last year, the Committee on Federal Student Aid at Nebraska Wesleyan University concluded that "students may earn a considerable proportion of their college expenses, carry an average number of hours, participate in a reasonable number of extra-curricula activities, and still earn better grades than the average student."

I am much more concerned over the objection that the number of students doing part-time work is making of the college a part-time institution. Looking at this tendency purely from the scholastic point of view, it is a great pity that self-supporting students are not able to give as much time as they wish to their courses. It is not merely that worry and the amount of time spent on outside work may have a demoralizing effect on their scholastic achievements. It is much more fundamental than that. The essence of the real scholar, in my opinion, is that he does not do only what he is told but a great deal more besides. He does not simply stick to the path pointed out to him but wanders off it out of curiosity and explores the territory on either side, discovering for himself many new and fascinating things. He is both thorough and of an inquiring mind. Given plenty of time, he will do a distinguished piece of work. Yet too often the student who is working his way through college is compelled to remain content with just getting by in each of his studies. He has no time to do the bits of exploration that make the difference between adequate and really good scholastic work.

On the other hand, the survey of last year's federal student aid program undertaken by the Office of Education reveals that in average scholastic achievement the college aid students were higher than the regular students in fifty-three per cent of the institutions, and in ninety-nine institutions submitting grades approximately fifty-five per cent of the students, a comparatively large number, received an average grade of "A" or "B." This superiority is explainable in several ways. In the first place, certain colleges have followed the policy of selecting students largely on the basis of high scholarship. In the second place, it is undoubtedly true that many of the

students selected to receive federal assistance not only wanted a college education to such a degree that they were willing to work hard for it but were of a conscientious type and thus made the most of the opportunity that was given them. An education, like most desirable things, is most highly valued when some sacrifice is made to acquire it. It is the exceptional person who fully appreciates the things which come to him easily and by natural right. Young men of wealth may have the pick of the universities of the world, but few of them realize how fortunate they are and how much they might gain by taking advantage of the opportunities which lie before them. So, in my opinion, the fundamental principle in back of the "work your way through college" theory still holds true—and it is upon this principle that the federal student aid program is firmly based.

We have still with us, of course, those who think it damaging to morale for young people to accept government-created opportunities. They tremble when they think how month by month the self-reliance and initiative of thousands of students is being undermined by this government program. Having gone to college at a time when it was comparatively easy for a young man to find a job that enabled him to meet his college expenses, it is hard for the conservatives to appreciate the fact that such opportunities no longer exist in their former abundance. Accordingly, a government program which creates part-time jobs for students seems to be designed to coddle and pamper the students rather than to encourage them to stand on their own feet. It is indeed regarded as an opening wedge for socialism or regimentation. The truth is, of course, that self-reliance and individual initiative are not destroyed by an abundance of opportunities but rather by a lack of them. And it makes little difference to youth how opportunities are created just as long as they exist. The real test comes when youth tries to make of these opportunities what they can and will. Then are self-reliance and initiative required.

We are agreed, I hope, then, that though the "earn your way through college" is not perfect—has, indeed, its pitfalls which we must be careful to recognize and, if possible, to avoid—nevertheless, the principle upon which it rests is still sound. Let us now see more specifically how the National Youth Administration fits into the picture. More than half the money allocated to the NYA is being used to provide student aid. Having modified and expanded last

year's FERA college aid program, the NYA is making it possible not only for college students but for secondary school and postgraduate students to earn sufficient funds with which to continue their education. Some 354,000 students throughout the country are now participating in this phase of our program. Of these, 121,500 are college students—an increase of 17,000 over the peak month of March, 1935—and 5,100 are postgraduate students. Quite a few of you here today are, I understand, in charge of the administration of your college's student aid program. For this reason I think you would be interested in a brief analysis of the forms of administration in other colleges and of the type of work students are being assigned.

Last year under the FERA—and I think it can safely be assumed that no radical changes have occurred since then—the program was usually administered by a special committee consisting of various combinations of administrative officers, academic officers and faculty members. Of the five most commonly used forms of administration forty per cent were of this type, though twenty-six per cent had the president as the administrative head, twelve per cent the dean of students, twelve per cent a member of the faculty and ten per cent the business office. As, of course, the NYA has left the administrative matters solely in the hands of the college officials, I myself am not acquainted with the comparative merits of these types of organizations. Yet it is interesting to note how widely they vary, depending, I assume, upon the size of the college, its location, and its personnel.

Of perhaps greater interest is the kind of work the students are performing. No survey of the whole NYA student aid program has yet been made; but the Ohio Youth Administration has just finished a study of the college and postgraduate programs in sixty-six colleges and universities. This study shows that by far the greater number of students are engaged in intra-mural work—approximately eighty-six per cent of the college students and ninety-six per cent of the postgraduate students. College students are most commonly performing clerical and office work, while graduate students are usually acting as research assistants. Among college students, work in libraries and museums, as laboratory assistants and as research assistants, is equally divided averaging between ten and twelve per cent apiece as compared with the thirty per cent who are doing clerical and office work. Fourteen per cent are engaged in extra-mural activities, six per cent as readers and graders

of papers and sixteen per cent are working on a number of miscellaneous projects.

The value of the work done by the students has depended upon the quality of the people in charge of the program. Where this has been carried out conscientiously and carefully—and in most instances I am happy to report that such has been the case—"Federal student aid," as the Director of Personnel at Iowa State College recently reported, "has been invaluable to the students. It has been of assistance in a financial way, and the training derived through this experience has been almost equivalent to another college career." Indeed, a survey of eighty-two Catholic colleges and universities made by the Department of Education of the National Catholic Welfare Conference showed that the federal student aid program has their "unanimous approval." And the letters which we have been receiving give further indication of this wide-spread approbation not only on the part of the colleges but also of the students as well.

Some of these letters have included suggestions for the improvement of the program, nine or ten of which I should like to present to you with the hope that at some time during this conference I may get your individual reactions to them. Because I am telling you of them, however, does not mean that they have my approval. It is simply that I believe those of you who have been administering and studying this program have probably weighed the merits of one or more of these proposals and have thought well or poorly of them for one reason or another. All I want to do now is to recall them to your minds, setting them before you at random rather than attempting to give them in the order of their importance.

It has been suggested:

First, that there be an early announcement as to whether or not the program is to be continued during the next school year and what its details will be. Students are anxious to make their plans for next fall; and the colleges themselves want to have plenty of time to arrange for the careful selection of students.

Second, that a person in the pay of the NYA be assigned to the supervision of the program in each college. Supervision in many instances has been found to be a full-time job for one man, which has meant additional expense for the college. It is felt, therefore, that the NYA should assume this expense—and one college proposes that an unemployed graduate might be hired for the job.

Third, that there be closer supervision of the students' work so that they will really earn the funds made available to them. One possible way of accomplishing this, according to a college authority, would be to have the college contribute, say, one-fourth of the students' wages. For example, if the students were receiving forty cents an hour the NYA's share would be thirty cents and the college's ten cents. Since the college would then have an interest in seeing to it that the students worked hard at socially desirable projects, closer supervision would result; and this being the case, the colleges might at the same time be given a wider latitude in selecting the student aid projects.

Fourth, that there be greater flexibility as to the requirements for freshmen. The reason given for this proposal is that freshmen have a hard enough time as it is making the necessary readjustments to college life and that to require them to do any great amount of outside work is to put them under a serious handicap.

Fifth, that the program take into account the differences in the cost of living and of a college education in the various parts of the country. Inasmuch as the expenses of the student in an Eastern college are considerably greater than those of the student in a Southern college, it is said that some adjustment should be made whereby the Eastern college student may be permitted to earn a larger sum of money. Though the Office of Education's report reveals that \$15 a month is enough to pay for both board and room in twenty per cent of the colleges throughout the country, nevertheless it comes nowhere near meeting these expenses in certain of our large colleges and universities. As a corollary to this, the proposal has been made that there should be recognition of the fact that some students, especially those in urban colleges, live at home and are therefore less in need of assistance.

Sixth, that not only should the quotas to the colleges be raised so that more students can be aided, but the amount of funds available to each student should be increased. This suggestion is based upon the growing number of self-supporting students, and the resultant necessity of spreading as far as possible among these students the limited funds now available. Supplementary to this is the suggestion which I have already mentioned that the hours of work be shortened and the rates of pay increased in order that students will not be so likely to over-work and will be able to take a greater part in some of the outside activities of the college.

Seventh, that there be a committee in charge of the student aid program, on which the NYA students should have representation. Students would thus be allowed to help select the jobs at which they work and determine the rates of pay.

Eighth, that only students of high scholastic standing be selected.

Ninth, that provisions be made whereby young people eligible for college aid shall be employed during the summer months on NYA work projects in their home communities and thus be enabled to earn the tuition necessary for continuing in college.

Tenth, that a plan of restricted scholarships supplement the present NYA program. Under this plan a few of the most highly competent students would be excused from the work requirement.

And finally, that the payroll and timekeeping procedure be simplified.

But, in addition to such helpful criticisms, we have also received criticisms of a less constructive sort. For example, during a recent nation-wide radio broadcast in which I participated it was charged that the NYA program "is placed almost entirely in the hands of individuals inexperienced in educational work." Coming at the close of the hour allotted to the broadcast, I did not have an opportunity to reply to this before the radio audience. But the answer, of course, is simple—the charge being completely without foundation. Not only was I, myself, a teacher in the public schools of Colorado for some years, but sixty per cent of the state directors have been drawn from the educational ranks. Nor has another charge made at that time—that the NYA program "is administered by a single person in Washington"—any basis in fact. Many of you here can testify to the freedom of action allowed to the administrators of student aid; and this policy holds true of the rest of the NYA's program. Its administration has been put into the hands of the state and local directors, with the small Washington staff acting simply as a coordinating and advisory unit. A third criticism was that "the NYA duplicates already existing agencies which could handle the job much more efficiently." With the student aid program being directly administered by the schools and colleges, it is obvious that no duplicating agency has been set up for the administration of this phase of the NYA's program. Nor have we set up any employment offices but have, on the contrary, provided them with extra help so that they could extend their services to youth. The apprenticeship training program is being supervised by the already established Federal

Committee on Apprentice Training. And the work projects are, in most instances, being planned and co-sponsored by local boards of education, recreation and park commissions, YMCAs, YWCAs, and similar public and private agencies which are contributing equipment, services and supervision. By working with and through these agencies and thus making use of existing facilities, the Youth Administration is putting a maximum proportion of the funds allocated to it into the pockets of needy young people.

It is, however, the young person as a student, who, taken as an individual, should be the touchstone of our mutual endeavors. Whatever policy benefits him most, that policy we should pursue. It is, of course, outside the NYA's province to say what this policy should be. Rather it is you and the other college authorities, to whom has been rightly given the responsibility for the selection of the students and the selection and supervision of their work, who must say whether or not the federal student aid program should be continued and what changes, if any, should be made in it. I do not need to remind you what a great responsibility this is and how important it is that the program be well administered. But I do want to impress upon you that the NYA has not laid down its regulations arbitrarily and indiscriminately. Wherever it has been necessary we have done our best to make things easier for you. We are as anxious as you are to have all red tape cleared away. We are as ready as you to make any changes that will enable you to open up the greatest possible number of opportunities to those ambitious, intelligent and industrious young men and women who wish to win for themselves a college education.

The Uses and Limitations of Tests in Selecting and Placing Students

ROBERT G. BERNREUTER

When I think about tests as they relate to the work of the registrar, the first question that comes to my mind is: "Should the registrar attempt to predict scholastic success?"

I am not sure that the answer is in the affirmative. I rather believe that there are some institutions in which the answer should be that it is no part of the registrar's duty to spend the institution's funds in predicting the success of the students who apply for admission. Certainly in those institutions that are capable of accepting and educating each student who applies, I should say that it is no part of the registrar's duties to predict scholastic success. I gather, though, from the meetings here that in many of your institutions it is rather an important thing for the registrar to know before the opening day of college which of the applicants will do good work and which will do poor work.

Suppose we consider the methods that a registrar may use to predict scholastic success. There are a number of them. They are not equally valuable. Let us assume that I am a registrar at an institution and that you are applicants. You want to come to my school. I suspect that there are some 300 people here. Suppose I can admit only 250. Presumably, I want the best 250. Of course, if the goodness of the student is based solely upon his ability to pay his fees, then my selection of the best students will be based upon your financial backing. But if I want to get the 250 best students from the scholastic point of view, it will be necessary for me to predict success for each one of you. I can merely guess, if I like. For example, I can have one of my clerks prepare 250 slips of paper and on each slip of paper I can put a mark. I can put them in the bottom drawer of my desk and mix them all up. Now, you come to me individually and say, "Please, Mister, may I come to your college?" I shall say, "Wait a minute, until I see how good a student you are going to be." I open the drawer and pick out a piece of paper. It may say "A." If so, I shall say, "Yes, you may come to my school because you will be a good student." Another one of you comes to me. I open the drawer and I pull out a piece of paper and read what it says, and I say, "No, you may not come because you will be a poor

student." That, of course, is a method that is based upon chance and chance alone, and I doubt that any of you would accept my recommendation if I were to recommend that you use it.

If we are going to predict with any degree of success, it is necessary for us to make our guesses with less error than we would have using the method I have just described. The trouble with the plain guessing method is that I am wrong so much of the time. And, occasionally, I am so greatly in error that my predictions can not be depended upon. What I need is a method which will reduce the amount of error that I make in my guesses.

Now, what are the methods that are really to be considered seriously—methods which will result in guessing what a student will do with a smaller amount of error than the guessing method? One method is to determine the previous scholastic success of the student. There is a relationship between a student's past and future scholastic success; and if by one means or another I may determine the scholastic success of each of you prior to the time that you apply to me, I shall have a method of predicting that will have less error than my method of plain guessing.

There are, in general, two ways by which I may determine previous scholastic success. Many of you use both methods. One is to get from the preparatory school a transcript of the record. That gives me an indication of the quality of the work you have done in the past. Another thing that I may do in order to get the same type of information is to give subject matter achievement tests. These are two separate methods of getting the same type of information. Both are sound methods, because there is a certain consistency in the quality of work that a student does; so there is a reasonable basis for assuming that the work that a student has done in the past will be indicative of the work he will do in the future. In a few moments I shall try to tell you how good those two methods are. First, I should like to sketch for you the other two methods that are available.

Presumably a student will fail or succeed in my institution, depending upon whether or not he has aptitude for learning the things that my faculty is going to present to him. If I can, by some means or other, determine whether or not each of you has the aptitude, or the aptitudes, necessary for learning the things that my faculty members are going to teach, I shall have a basis for making my guesses that will have less error than will straight chance.

There are in general two types of aptitude tests, the general aptitude tests, which we usually call intelligence tests, and specific aptitude tests. Those of you who are connected with engineering schools will probably agree with me when I say that one of the things necessary for success in an engineering school is the ability to visualize shapes and to manipulate your visualizations of those shapes—the sort of thing, for example, that you have to do in your descriptive geometry course. That ability is necessary for success in an engineering school; so, if my task is to select students for an engineering school, one of the specific aptitudes that I shall probably want to measure is the ability to visualize shapes and to manipulate the visualizations of those shapes. If my task is to select students for the music department, I may find that a good test will be one which measures music talent; specific music talent, not just general learning ability. So I may say that another method of predicting success that will have smaller error than my guessing method is one which gives me information concerning the general abilities or the specific abilities of the prospective students.

Also, I may do something in addition to these methods I have mentioned. I may combine some of them. I may combine the achievement tests with the high school record, and, if I like, I may combine with these the intelligence tests, and, if I like, I may combine with these the tests of specific aptitude, or I may use any combination of these criteria.

That fairly well covers the list of methods that are available for the selection of students. There are some other methods that are almost worth while, but for rather highly specialized reasons they are not. For example, there are certainly some personal factors that interfere with the utilization of aptitudes. We all know students who come to college with plenty of ability to do successful college work, but make poor scholastic records because of factors in their environments which prevent them from using their aptitudes. Presumably, one could measure some of these factors and use them in predicting scholastic success. Unfortunately, no really satisfactory method of measuring these factors has been developed—that is, no very satisfactory method has been developed which may be used by the registrar in his particular setup. The reason for that will be made clear in a few moments.

Here, then, are the more important of the methods that a registrar has available for predicting scholastic success. Now which one

should I use? Which is the best? You will agree with me that my guessing method is of no value. How good is the method of getting high school records? Correlation coefficients are always very difficult to interpret and I am not going to give you any correlation coefficients, but I am going to tell you the amount by which my guessing error will be reduced by using the different methods.

Of all the studies I have seen reported concerning the value of the high school record as a means of predicting success, the one which showed the greatest amount of value was one in which the amount of error was reduced by 36 per cent, slightly more than one-third. It is not very much, is it? I reviewed a good many studies and I think probably that is just about a maximum figure. You can not hope, under usual circumstances, to predict the success of your entering students by this method with an error less than nearly two-thirds as great as you would have if you just guessed, and that is the maximum, not the average amount. The average amount of reduction of error that has been obtained through the use of high school records is considerably smaller than that. I hesitate to give it to you, because some of you may feel that I have a prejudice against your pet method. The average amount of reduction of error when the high school record alone is used is 16 per cent. In other words, your error in predicting is 84 per cent as great after you have the high school record as it is before. Now, there is only one saving grace. Your reduction of error is greatest at the extremes. It is at the middle of the distribution that you have the greatest difficulty in eliminating error; so, when I say that, on the average, your error will be reduced only 16 per cent by the use of the high school records, it is not quite as bad as it sounds, because your reduction of error will be greatest among the poor students and the good students. It will hardly be reduced at all along the main bulk of students.

When you hear me say this you will probably believe that it is my opinion that the high school record is a very poor method, and that possibly it is a much poorer method than certain others. But, unfortunately, it is not. If you use achievement tests instead of high school records for your method of determining scholastic success, you get virtually the same values. The maximum amount of reduction of error you can expect will be the same as if you use high school records. The average amount of reduction of error will be virtually the same. There is certainly no significant difference.

Which method shall you use? Shall you give achievement tests

or shall you use high school records? That probably depends upon your own setup. They are about equally good. There is certainly less expense involved in collecting high school records than there is in giving achievement tests. However, achievement tests give you scores that are fairly comparable for all of your students; and I have heard you tell each other that you can not always depend upon the meaning of the marks that the high schools send you. So there are advantages and disadvantages to each system.

How good are intelligence tests? They are fairly good, because success in an intelligence test depends upon the exercise of ability, which is the same as the ability necessary for success in college work. But how much will the error be reduced? The greatest amount of reduction of error I have been able to discover in any study is only 29 per cent less than one-third. The average reduction of error is only 10 per cent. The error still is 90 per cent as great as it was when you reached into the drawer and pulled out your slips by chance.

How good are tests of specific aptitude? I hesitate to answer that question because I have the feeling that not nearly enough work has been done on their use as yet to justify giving a numerical answer. Far less work has been done on the measurement of specific aptitude than on the measurement of general aptitude. But here are the values, as far as I have them.

The maximum amount of reduction for the estimation of general scholastic success is 25 per cent and the average amount of reduction is 7 per cent. That is hardly worth bothering about, I should say. However, I do feel that in the future more work will be done in devising tests of specific aptitude and that these values can be increased materially.

How good are combination methods? The best combination that I have heard of, which has resulted in the greatest reduction of error, is one which combines the following indexes: the high school record, an English test, and an intelligence test. When those three indicators were combined, the amount of reduction was 41 per cent. The average of all the combination methods is only 24 per cent. If you have average luck in your predictions and if you will use the average combination of criteria, you will probably be guessing with about 75 per cent as much error as if you made plain guesses. That is virtually the upper limit. Registrars need not criticize themselves when they predict scholastic success with that amount of error be-

cause no one else can do any better. Even if you use the best methods that test constructors and educational theorists have been able to develop, the error will still be about 60 per cent as great as it would otherwise be, and the chances are it would be three-fourths as great as if you did not spend a nickel of the institution's money.

Now, what about the measurement of interest and the measurement of personality traits? Certainly those play a part in determining scholastic success. If you merely use an interest test or a personal trait test, you will reduce the amount of error virtually not at all. Nevertheless, those are important factors. For instance, one study has been made by Dr. Stagner in which he found that among those students who are emotionally stable and who are rather self-sufficient and who are rather dominant, so that they stick up for their rights, there is a relatively high relationship between scores on an intelligence test and scholastic success. But in a group of students who are rather unstable emotionally and who are rather submissive, there is a lower correlation. I am not quite sure why that is so. I suspect it is because the student who sticks up for his rights gets about what he deserves, whereas the student who does not stick up for his rights may, in some instances, get less than he deserves. In other instances he may have a better scholastic record than you expect of him, because he very meekly and very mildly does everything the professor tells him to do, even though those things are not personally profitable to him. If a student is normal in his general personality traits, your predictions will probably be pretty good. At least they will be better than they would be if you were dealing with a group of unstable, submissive students.

But still that is not useful to the registrar. I do not advise the registrar to use either interest tests or personality trait tests as entrance tests for this important reason. So-called personality trait tests and so-called interest tests are not tests at all. A test always contains certain tasks at which a student works. And presumably he does his best and you expect him to make as good showing as possible. On a so-called interest test, or personality trait test, you do not expect him to make the best showing possible. You expect him to make the fairest showing possible. You expect him to describe himself as he is, not as someone else would like to have him be or not as he would like to be. And consequently, if you use an interest test, or personality trait test, it is almost certain that students will come to know that over a period of years they will

make a better impression upon the registrar if they report not what they are like, but what they would like to be like, or what the registrar would like to have them be like. And for that reason the things simply are of no value for the selection of college students. I would not recommend them for use in my own institution or any other institution for that purpose.

Here is a second question I have concerning a registrar's responsibilities:

Should a registrar furnish to student advisers and to guidance counselors any information about the students beyond class marks?

I really do not know. Hearing your discussions has raised that question in my mind. At some institutions that is the responsibility of the personnel office and is not the responsibility of the registrar at all. At other institutions that is considered to be a part of the registrar's obligations. But supposing that it is accepted as the legitimate function of the registrar's office, what sort of information can a registrar furnish that will be of some use to an adviser or counselor?

As I think over the possibilities, one thing that I can think of is that the registrar might furnish information concerning the student's potential level of achievement. What is the best you can expect of the student? Or what is a reasonable amount to expect of him? That is something that is important for counselors to know. The registrar can not give a perfect answer to that, but he can improve the guess of the counselor, if he will furnish intelligence test scores or specialized aptitude test scores.

Another thing that an adviser can use profitably is information concerning actual achievement, and that of course is represented by class marks. All of you, I presume, do report to the advisers the marks of the students.

A third thing that, under some circumstances, a registrar might furnish is information concerning the interests of a student. I suppose that might be done by a variety of methods. It might be done, for example, by collecting information concerning extra-curricular activities of students.

Another thing you could do would be to use interest tests. Interest tests are not good for selecting students, but they have a demonstrated value in helping an adviser place a student in the various departments of your institution after he has been accepted.

Another type of information that the registrar can furnish is

concerned with personality traits. He may do that by making available the ratings given by the high school principals. Or he may collect informal ratings, or even formalized ratings from fellow students, or from faculty members, concerning the personal traits of the individual. Or he may do it in a still more formal way by the use of personality trait tests. I think that a personality trait test is of no importance at all to the registrar as such, but I do believe it is of importance to student advisers and student counselors. It is important to them because the use of such instruments spots a student who is in the need of counseling. That really is one of the major functions of personality trait tests. Out of the group of students who come to your college, the proper use of such tests will usually pick out—again not without error, but with reduction of error—those students who are seriously in need of counseling.

The last question I want to ask is this, Should a registrar conduct research? Particularly, should he conduct research which will help the administration in the formulation of policies? One reason why that strikes me as important is that I know of one institution in which a bit of research has been of very material benefit to the administration. It is a private junior college that was founded to train leaders. The students at this particular institution come from superior social and economic levels. It is rather a safe guess, I believe, that the majority of the students at that institution will be in positions of prominence after they get out of school. At this institution a number of the faculty members were asked to select from the student body boys whom they thought were representative of the type of student that the institution should encourage to come; and to those boys who were the delights of the faculty, personality trait tests were given. What was discovered? At this institution, founded and continued for the purpose of developing leaders, it was found that the student who was dear to the hearts of the faculty member was a student who was rather submissive, rather more easily upset emotionally than the average student, and rather lacking in self-sufficiency.

Those of you who have been faculty members or who are still faculty members will understand why that is so. It is a nuisance to have in your class a student who really is a leader. He does not like to follow you. That institution wanted to train leaders—at least, that is what it said in the catalogue. But the faculty members in that institution did not want to train any leaders—they wanted

to train nice, polite, social boys, who did not talk back to their superiors. The bit of research conducted in that institution very clearly demonstrated that the ambitions of the administration were being undermined by the personal idiosyncrasies of the faculty members.

Now I might summarize by saying that I believe tests are of value to the registrar under one set of circumstances only. If the results of the tests are going to be used by someone around the institution, they should be given, and possibly the registrar should give them. If the results of the tests are not going to be used by anyone, they should not be administered. There is nothing magical about the administration of a test. And if all you are going to do after you have spent the money to procure a test, to administer it, and to score it, is to make a nice list of the scores and file it away in your office, there is no use spending the money. And, finally, tests are about as good as any other method that you can have of predicting the future success of students. But, unfortunately, they have very serious limitations that registrars should not overlook.

Symposium

The Registrar's Office as a Service Station for Scholarship Charts, Reports, and Statistics

(Arranged by the Committee on Special Projects)

THE REGISTRAR'S REPORTS ON STUDENT GRADES

H. H. ARMSBY

There is a well-known saying which is phrased in many ways, one of which is "The reward of work well done is to have done it." Probably in the majority of cases this is about the only reward obtained. Perhaps some rare spirits are entirely satisfied with this reward, but the great majority of human beings would be much happier if they could have some reward which is a little more conspicuous—something which will attract the attention of their fellow-men and win their esteem, their praise, and perhaps even their envy. Each of us likes to excel his fellows in something, and likes to have people know about it.

College students are human beings (believe it or not) and they want to be rewarded when they do a good piece of work. In fact, many of them will not make much effort to do good work unless they can see some sort of a reward ahead. Of course, the *real* reward for good work in college is the knowledge and mental training acquired; and college students *ought* to work for this reward. However, most college students are not mentally mature enough to appreciate this point of view, and most of them need some other incentive—some tangible reward which they and their fellows can see. Hence credit hours, honor points, honor societies, degrees "Cum laude," honors courses, excess credits, and all the devices for rewarding and stimulating good scholastic work exist and probably will continue to exist for a long time to come.

While it is undoubtedly true that many professors assign their grades quite unscientifically and that discrepancies and even injustices are numerous; still the grading is for the most part done *conscientiously*, if not scientifically, and in the long run a student's grades give a fairly good picture of his general college performance; whether it be a true picture of his real *ability* or merely a measure of his effort. Studies such as the famous one made by Mr. Walter

S. Gifford, President of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company, show that there is a very distinct relationship between success in college and success in business.

The registrar's office is, of course, the collecting point for grades, and is the most convenient and logical center for their publication if they are to be published. And surely if grades *are* valuable indicators of a student's progress in college and of his future success, they can and should be not merely recorded but actively used in a variety of ways to give information to persons legitimately interested in individual students or groups of students, and to serve as a stimulus to these same individuals and groups.

Probably no two registrars would agree perfectly as to all details of the program to be followed in making grades available. But possibly out of the discussion of which this paper is a part may arise some sort of an agreement on fundamental policies—on what is to be reported, and to whom.

This paper will consist of an outline of the principal uses of student grades made by the writer, describing some of the forms employed, with brief notes as to their uses. The writer presents his own forms and procedures not as ideal, but merely as a basis for discussion.

I. REPORTS ON INDIVIDUAL STUDENTS

A. *To Parents*

1. *Failures at End of First Month.* Reports of failures at the end of the first month are collected from the faculty on a simple mimeographed form which is not permanently preserved but is destroyed at the end of the semester. Failures of freshmen are reported to their parents on a printed form, which explains to the parents our desire for their co-operation in our attempts to remedy students' weaknesses and to aid them in improving their work. The parents are also advised on this report that complete grade reports will be sent them at the middle and at the end of the semester. Failures reported for other students are used in checking certain scholastic rules, determining athletic eligibility, and similar uses.

2. *Mid-Semester and Final Grades.* The faculty report grades for all students at mid-semester and at the end of the semester on sheets which are typed in the Registrar's office. The sheets are made in such a way that they and the personnel report (illustrated later in this paper) can be typed at one impression. Two copies of the grade

report sheets are sent to the department heads shortly before mid-semester, with a mimeographed slip showing the date on which the reports are due and giving brief instructions for filling them out. The department sends the original to the office and retains the copy for announcement of grades to the students. Grade sheets are returned to the departments near the end of the semester for final grades, and, after these have been posted, are bound by years and filed in the Registrar's vault.

Grades are reported to parents on sections of a large form, commonly called "the blanket form." This form is a perforated one, consisting of ten coupons and twelve class cards (each class card consisting of two parts). The "blanket form" is filled out by the student on registration day and checked by specially trained student clerks. Forms are alphabetized, torn apart, and distributed to the proper persons through the faculty exchange, giving to each teacher a complete class roll of each class; to the registrar a complete alphabetical file of matriculation cards, a complete geographic file, and class rolls for all classes; to the library, the city post office, the school hospital, the department heads, the school paper, and the local churches, a complete list of students in whom they are interested—all before the first class meets.

The grade report coupons need only to have the grades filled in to be ready for mailing, (plus, of course, corrections for changes in schedule). A small printed slip explaining the grading system and the scholastic rules of the school accompanies each report card. One girl fills out these reports and mails them (envelopes are addressed in advance) at the rate of about one hundred an hour.

3. *Grades for Summer Surveying Course.* These grades are reported on a small mimeographed form, which is complete except for the student's name and grade. This report is also accompanied by the small printed explanation of the grading system.

4. *Scholastic Deficiency.* Students and their parents are notified of scholastic deficiency by means of a form which lists all the rules governing unsatisfactory work, and the various ways in which a case may be settled by the Faculty Committee in charge of re-admissions. The form needs only the student's name and two or three check marks to complete it. One copy of the form goes to the student, one to his parents, and one to the Registrar's file. The first semester closes at noon on Friday, and by ten o'clock that night the deficiency list is made out (see next paragraph), envelopes ad-

dressed to each student on the list and to his parents, a Book of Rules in each envelope, and the three copies of this form complete, except for the final check mark indicating action of the Committee. Those not requiring action by the Committee are in the mail that night. The Committee meets Saturday morning, and when it adjourns all the notices are ready for mailing—so that students know their fate before registration for the second semester starts on Monday morning.

B. To Faculty

1. *Scholastic Deficiencies.* Scholastic deficiencies are reported to the faculty on a form on which the various rules governing unsatisfactory work are stated in exactly the same terms that appear on the form which is sent to the student and parent (described in the last paragraph). Under the statement of the rules is a ruled portion of the form on which all the names are entered with the student's class and curriculum and the rule under which he is deficient. Space is provided for the Committee action, and this space is filled out during the Committee meeting. One copy of this report is sent to the Director, one to the Secretary of the Faculty, and one to the Registrar's file.

C. To High School Principals

1. *First Semester Grades.* (Freshmen only.) These grades are reported on a small printed form on which the regular freshman schedule (required of all regular students) is printed. The report is completed by adding the student's name, the name of his high school, his grades, his average grade, and the fifth of the class in which he ranks. This report also is accompanied by the small printed explanation slip previously mentioned.

2. *Scholastic Records to Date.* (All students.) When the Registrar visits a high school (he speaks at about 80 a year), he takes to the Principal a report on all students in college from that high school, on Form 73 (Plate I). This form may also be used for almost any special group of students.

D. To Athletic Director

1. *Eligibility of Members of Athletic Squads.* Members of athletic squads are checked after each of the three grade reports each semester, and the Athletic Director is notified by letter if any of them are ineligible for competition under the rules of the faculty.

2. *A List of Probationers* is sent to the Athletic Director at the opening of each semester, since probationers are ineligible for inter-collegiate competition.

E. To Fraternities and General Campus Organizations

1. *A Statement of Eligibility* must be secured from the office by any student organization before it may initiate a new member. Both school rulings and organization requirements (often the more rigid) are checked.

F. To Honor Societies

1. *Tau Beta Pi* (honor engineering fraternity) awards a slide rule to the honor student of the freshman class, and membership to juniors and seniors who meet their requirements.

2. *Phi Kappa Phi* (general honor society) awards book plates to the upper fifteen per cent of each class each year, and membership to seniors who meet their requirements.

Both organizations rely on the office for determination of scholastic averages on which these awards are based. All these honors are posted on the student's record card, and membership lists in these two organizations are published on the Commencement program.

G. For School Honors

1. *Upper Fifth of Freshman Class*. This award is based on a composite of placement test ratings, personnel ratings, first semester grades, and recommendations from all departments teaching freshmen, and is issued about the middle of the second semester. The list is posted on the school bulletin boards and published in the student paper. An individual letter is sent to each student and to his parents, and the honor is posted on his record card.

2. *Curators' Scholarships*. These are awarded to entering freshmen on the basis of high school records and an examination. Successful candidates, their parents, and their high school principals are notified by letter. Some of the scholarships continue into later years, and are based on college records. Students and parents are notified, and all such awards are posted on the students' record cards.

3. *Honors at Graduation*. On the Commencement program appears the name of the highest ranking student in the graduating class, as receiving "Highest Honors"; all students averaging above 2.00 for

four years' work receive "First Honors"; all those above 1.75 receive "Second Honors." These awards are all posted on the students' record cards.

4. *The Rank in the Graduating Class* is determined for each graduate, and is posted on his record card.

H. To Loan Fund Administrators

Confidential reports are made on all applicants for loans, to the Director for school loan funds; to the administrators for other funds.

J. To Prospective Employers

1. *Transcript of College Record.* Our official transcript blank follows very closely the uniform transcript blank adopted by the American Association of Collegiate Registrars, and the column headings on the transcript are exactly the same as those on our permanent record card, which means that making a transcript calls merely for direct copying in so far as the record of grades is concerned.

2. *Personnel Reports.* While not strictly grade reports, these reports are considered very important, both by school officials and employment officers. In fact, many of the latter consider them as of much more value than the grade reports. The Personnel Report, Form 47 (Plate II (a) and (b)), is prepared with the grade report blank previously mentioned and sent to each instructor before mid-semester. He is asked to rate each student on each of the questions shown and to return it to the office by the end of the third month of the semester. His ratings are posted on the Personnel Record, Form 48 (Plate III), as small circles or dots in the proper columns under each characteristic. (The horizontal lines divide the record under each characteristic into successive school years.) The report is then returned to the instructor, to do with as he sees fit.

The Personnel Record card, when filled out over a period of three or four years, gives a very good composite picture of the impressions the student has made on his instructors, and how he has changed during his stay in college.

For reporting to prospective employers and others, the Personnel Record is transcribed onto Form 48a (Plate IV).

II. REPORTS ON STUDENT GROUPS

A. Fraternity Grade Report

This report, which formerly included all student organizations, but which was reduced in scope due to reduced funds, has been

School of Mines and Metallurgy

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

ROLLA

PERSONNEL REPORT

DEPARTMENT	NAME OF COURSE	CAT. NO.	CREDIT HRS.
------------	----------------	----------	-------------

[illegible]

Semester

Teacher

INSTRUCTIONS

This report is due at the Student Advisor's office at the end of the third month of the semester.

The instructor is asked to rate the students in his class on the characteristics defined by the questions listed below, using the letter S to designate those students whom he considers to be above average in the characteristic being rated; the letter I to designate those whom he considers to be below average; and the letter M to designate those who do not impress him as departing materially from the average.

The instructor is asked to give his personal opinion on each student, using all the information at his disposal, and not limiting himself to the student's class work if he has other knowledge of him.

- A. How do you rate the student as to general mental ability? (This might or might not agree with his grade in your course.) The information wanted is "What CAN he do?," rather than "What is he doing?"
 - B. How do you rate the student as to his industry, application to his work and persistency of effort?
 - *C. How does the student impress you with respect to his ability to shift for himself; to go ahead with his work without frequent assistance from his instructor or from his fellow students?
 - *D. How do you rate the student as to his capacity for directing, controlling, or influencing others?
 - *E. How do you rate the student as to his reliability, sense of responsibility, and sincerity of purpose?
 - F. How do you rate the student as to his success in winning confidence and respect through his appearance, speech, and manners?
 - **G. If any students listed on this report impress you as showing promise of attaining more than ordinary success in their profession, please indicate them by writing in column G the type of work for which you believe each such student best fitted. Indicate ONLY THE SUPERIOR STUDENTS in this column. The following are suggested classifications: Research, Teaching, Construction, Design, Management, Executive. Use other terms if none of the above appear to fit the student.
 - * On qualities C, D, and E, ratings should be reported for all students whom the instructor feels he can conscientiously rate.
 - ** On quality G rate only the outstandingly promising students.
- On qualities A, B, and F, ALL students are to be rated.

PLATE II (b)

BORN _____ 1ST ENTRANCE _____ ENT. COND'S _____										
FATHER'S NAME _____ OCCUPATION _____ LIVING? _____										
PERSONNEL RATINGS (SEE BACK OF CARD FOR DEFINITIONS)							PLACEMENT EXAMINATIONS			
	PERSONNEL RATINGS				PERSONNEL RATINGS			PLACEMENT EXAMINATIONS		
	SUPERIOR	MEDIUM	INFERIOR		SUPERIOR	MEDIUM	INFERIOR		SCORE	INT. GRADE
INTELLIGENCE				LEADERSHIP				CHEM. APT.		
								CHEM. TRAIN.		
								DRAW. APT.		
								DRAW. TRAIN.		
ENERGY				RELIABILITY				ENG. APT.		
								ENG. TRAIN.		
								MATH. APT.		
								MATH. TRAIN.		
INITIATIVE				PERSONALITY				PHYS. APT.		
								PHYS. TRAIN.		
FRATERNITY _____ HOME ADDRESS _____										
(Front)										
ACTIVITIES _____							HONORS _____			
OCCUPATIONS _____							DISCIPLINE _____			

DEFINITIONS.—(Instructors are asked to report grades in answer to the following questions):

INTELLIGENCE: How do you rate the student as to general mental ability? (This might or might not agree with his grade in your course.) The information wanted is "What CAN he do?" rather than "What is he doing?"

ENERGY: How do you rate the student as to his industry, application to his work, and persistency of effort?

INITIATIVE: How does the student impress you with respect to his ability to shift for himself; to go ahead with his work without frequent assistance from his instructors or from his fellow students?

LEADERSHIP: How do you rate the student as to his capacity for directing, controlling, or influencing others?

RELIABILITY: How do you rate the student as to his reliability, sense of responsibility, and sincerity of purpose?

PERSONALITY: How do you rate the student as to his success in winning confidence and respect through his appearance, speech, and manners?

PROMISE OF SUCCESS: If the student impresses you as showing promise of attaining more than ordinary success in his profession, please indicate the type of work for which you believe him to be best fitted.

R 48 1000 6-32-57 A0721

(Back)

PLATE III



School of Mines and Metallurgy
UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI
ROLLA

OFFICE OF REGISTRAR
AND STUDENT ADVISOR

PERSONNEL RECORD

The student is rated each semester by each of his instructors as being either Superior, Medium, or Inferior in the qualities defined by the questions listed below. The tabulation shows the distribution of all such ratings reported to date for this student.

Total Ratings Received During _____ Years

SUPERIOR **MEDIUM** **INFERIOR**

INTELLIGENCE: How do you rate the student as to general mental ability? (This might or might not agree with his grade in your course.) The information wanted is "What CAN he do?" rather than "What is he doing?"

ENERGY: How do you rate the student as to his industry, application to his work, and persistency of effort?

INITIATIVE: How does the student impress you with respect to his ability to shift for himself; to go ahead with his work without frequent assistance from his instructors or from his fellow students?

LEADERSHIP: How do you rate the student as to his capacity for directing, controlling, or influencing others?

RELIABILITY: How do you rate the student as to his reliability, sense of responsibility, and sincerity of purpose?

PERSONALITY: How do you rate the student as to his success in winning confidence and respect through his appearance, speech, and manners?

PROMISE OF SUCCESS: If the student impresses you as showing promise of attaining more than ordinary success in his profession, please indicate the type of work for which you believe him to be best fitted.

*On these qualities ratings are optional with instructor. Others are required.

Activities

Honors

The student's average grade to date is _____

The average grade of the student body is _____

The average required for graduation is _____

Student Advisor.

issued for many years, is eagerly awaited by the students, and has done much to improve the general scholastic tone of the institution. Tau Beta Pi awards a cup each semester to the group (fraternity or independent) having the highest rating on this report. Copies of the report are sent to the national offices of all fraternities represented on the campus, to the National Interfraternity Conference, to many interested deans of men and registrars, to interested faculty members, and, of course, to the fraternity chapters themselves. The report is made out according to the ranking method approved by the deans of men, the National Interfraternity Conference, and by the American Association of Collegiate Registrars. (The writer happens to have been one of the committee of the Association of Deans of Men which originally devised this ranking plan for comparing reports from institutions having different grading systems.)

On our work sheets, which are used in preparing the report, the student's name, class, and hours scheduled are filled out before the end of the semester, leaving less work to be done after the grade reports are received. We are usually able to issue the report within one or two weeks after the close of the first semester, and within two days after the close of the Summer Surveying class, which is counted as a part of the second semester.

The general report consists of three pages—the first, a general statement as to the method of determining the averages; the second, the general report showing for each organization rated the number of students, the total credit hours and grade points, the average grade for the group, and the ranking of the group according to the ranking method previously mentioned. On this sheet the names of the fraternities, the independents, and the entire school, are capitalized and offset for easy identification. The third sheet is a supplementary report for fraternity officials, giving separate averages for active members and for pledges.

A complete detailed report for each fraternity, showing the figures for each individual member, is also prepared and sent to the chapter and to its national offices, with the general report just mentioned.

B. Report on Probationers

A report on students who have been on probation during the semester is prepared at the end of each semester, for the information of the Curricula Committee, which is charged with the duty of granting or denying petitions for re-admission. The report shows

hours scheduled, hours passed, grade points earned, average grades, and whether or not each student has satisfied the terms of his probation.

C. Special Reports

Special reports are made from time to time on request, as for example, the averages of seniors by departments—averages of athletic teams, of students by states, by high schools, etc. These reports are generally made on either Form 73 (Plate I) or on the form used as a work sheet in preparing the Fraternity Grade Report.

III. REPORTS OF GRADE DISTRIBUTIONS

A report is made to the faculty, each semester, of the distribution of grades in each department. Since we started making these reports the grading practice, in which wide variations between departments formerly existed, has shown a quite remarkable tendency toward uniformity. There are, of course, differences between departments teaching only upper classmen and those teaching freshmen, as there should be; but departments which might be expected to have about the same standards of grading now have them, for the most part. The administrative officers have never made any comments on the distribution of grades. We have simply presented the figures, and let the departments draw their own conclusions.

Our work sheets for this report are made out before the end of the semester, listing each instructor and each course which he is teaching, and having one column for each of the various grades which may be reported. As the grade reports come in, the grades are counted and listed under the proper column heading. When all grades have been entered, the columns are added by departments and converted into percentages of the total number of grades in the department. These percentages, together with the total number of grades and the average grade for the department, are the figures reported to the faculty. The averages for individual instructors are not published, but are available to the instructor or to his department head if wanted.

This brief summary has set forth what might be called our "standard" reports of grades. We believe that grades have a real significance, and we attempt to make use of them in any way which we feel can benefit the school or any student or group of students in it. We make many special reports on individuals and groups dur-

ing the course of a school year. Our faculty and students know they can get such reports and they do not hesitate to ask for them—nor do we hesitate to accommodate them. We believe that furnishing such information is one of the reasons for the existence of the office of Registrar.

PRACTICE AT STANFORD UNIVERSITY

J. P. MITCHELL

We have made a study of the significance of the high school pattern. We have had an accumulation of some 30 or 40 years' experience, and if there is any merit in a particular combination of high school subjects, for example, in three years of mathematics as against none, or three years of Latin as against none, it should show in the results. If we could take the records of a sufficiently large number who have been at the University and examine them and go back to the high school pattern, if there is merit in the traditional combination of high school subjects, it should show.

We have worked on it, and the results are so confusing that I never have felt willing as yet to present them to this group. But I can say offhand that we cannot find any relationship. There is such a confused mass of implications that we are not ready to talk about it. No larger proportion of those with three years of mathematics, stood in the upper third of their classes, or excelled those who had no mathematics.

That is not novel. Others have found the same thing. Some day perhaps we shall have some results worth presenting in detail. It is interesting that other colleges are tending in that direction. We have placed our requirements for admission on the basis of ability rather than on any particular combination of subjects. Frankly, I could never see why any institution should refuse admission to a man because he had not studied any particular subject which they gave in their own institution. I just cannot see it. If the applicant shows real ability and real merit and has brains, what if he has not had trigonometry? He can get it—and will get it—if he has ability. So we try to base our admission system on evidence of ability rather than on the evidence of exposure to certain subjects. I think it was Dr. Jordan himself who once used the phrase that one cannot measure an education in terms of the subjects studied.

That is something of a digression started by my introduction. I was asked to tell you about the records that we keep, and our reports to outside groups as to what our students have done.

In the first place, we have not built up any system of forms or charts such as Mr. Armsby has shown you, perhaps for the simple reason that some years ago we adopted the photographic method of reproducing records, which was developed by others. We merely followed in their footsteps and have found it immensely satisfactory, and have done away with practically all other forms since it is so inexpensive to photograph students' records—and it is a perfectly adequate, satisfactory and complete statement of the student's progress. We have mailed to each student at the end of each quarter, not a report on the grades for that term, but a photograph of his whole record to date. It is cheaper and faster and I cannot speak too enthusiastically of the possibilities of the method. It is not any particular tribute to my particular office that we do it successfully; it is inherent in the plan.

We have about 3,500 students. We can do this sort of thing with that system. We can have an examination period which closes on Friday, with the reports due from the faculty on Monday. Of course, many come in earlier, and one or two, occasionally, later, but with Monday the day when reports are due, for this last quarter, for example, by Thursday night we had mailed to every student who left an addressed envelope a complete photograph of his record to date. For the others, we have the reports in the office. That is very rapid work, when you think of it, for a number such as 3,500, and it could be done for 5,000 as well. I am not speaking of it as an achievement for our particular group. It is the sort of thing you can do with that particular system, and the advantages, I think, are obvious.

Now, we do not send grade reports to parents. We assume that the student will keep his family informed as to his progress. If the parent asks for that information, we mail a duplicate photograph of his record to date, accompanied by a letter without using any elaborate forms.

We send to the high schools, at the end of the first quarter, a photograph of the records of their first-year students showing what they have done during the first quarter in the University. We do it at the end of one quarter, under protest, for that seems too short a period to be really significant. We should prefer to wait for two quarters, and it is very likely we should wait for a full year. That is

an open question. But the high school seems to be somewhat restless during the year and wants the information, and that seems to be the more acceptable time to do it. I have had misgivings myself as to whether it is worth while. I am very sure some schools just throw them away. Others are interested. I think it might be economy if we found out the schools that want them and those that do not, and send them only to those that do, but, as a matter of practice, we send them to all high schools at the end of the first quarter. We do not send them promptly. It is the sort of job that can be delayed a little, so we do it at our convenience during the next six weeks.

Other than that, we do not distribute grade reports, except to our own department and advisers' offices. We do one thing, however; we print a quarterly directory of all the students, which is common, but in this directory we give the academic standing of every student, in terms of hours passed and grade points earned. After John Smith's name will be the notation—70 plus 32, which means he has 70 hours and he is 32 grade points ahead. It may be 60 minus 20, which discloses his status very quickly. So; there are no secrets. Everybody knows everybody else's story. And the parents of the students can get copies, and they can look up their friends and their relations and see how they stand. It accomplishes a good deal. I think it is a very good thing to do. There is some debate about it. Some feel it is an infringement of personal liberty, you might say, but I do not think so. I think in a college community the students are all interested in each other's scores, and it prevents a lot of bluffing and petty deceiving as to accomplishments. And, also, it does another thing. It is the most potent influence to keep the registrar's records right. Because, if we make one error—and, of course, we occasionally do, or a professor turns in the wrong grade, as professors occasionally do, we find it out right away and get it right. Furthermore, there are few troubles during the last term about graduation. Few come along thinking they are going to graduate and find they are not. It is all perfectly clear and understood in advance, so I think, after all, it is a good plan.

With that publicity available, there is no need for much else in the way of reports. We print also in the Directory, the names of holders of scholarships; and lower division honors and graduation honors are given in the commencement program; and lists of those elected to Phi Beta Kappa and honorary societies are given publicity in the college paper. We have a scheme very similar to that

which has been explained to you whereby we classify the standing of student organizations by groups. We get out a table at the end of the academic year, showing the grade point ratio, as we call it, for the whole university by terms and for the year, for women and for men, sorority and non-sorority, fraternity and non-fraternity, classified by residents within the different dormitories and living groups.

We also print the relative standing of these different groups, using for that system the plan, which I think Mr. Armsby first worked out, of giving it in terms of steps, par, plus 1, plus 2, plus 3; minus 1, minus 2 and perhaps minus 3. They used to try to arrange them in order of actual rank, to the third decimal place of the grade point average. We all know too much about grade points, I think, to believe that the third decimal point has any significance whatsoever. It is a misleading notion that any such mathematical accuracy can be built out of grades. But the method of giving the standing by steps is a perfectly sound one, and these charts are sent to all the organizations concerned; and the different fraternities, for example, watch their standing as compared to the other fraternities, with a good deal of care. These charts are reprinted in the Annual Report. We give in the Annual Report a good deal of information which is available to anyone who is interested concerning the outcome of the year's work.

We have had one rather interesting figure. It is, the proportion of freshmen admitted who graduate four years later. One of the results of our selective admission was to get a very gratifying increase in that number. In the past, perhaps two-thirds of the freshmen used to come back as sophomores, and about half graduated. That is a fairly normal experience. We worked up to the point where about 85 per cent came back as sophomores and two-thirds graduated. If you can graduate two-thirds of the freshmen, that is not a bad situation. Of course, that allows for dropping out because of all reasons, not only for scholastic, but also for sickness, financial troubles, the family moving away, transfer to other institutions, etc.

During the last two years, the proportion of freshmen graduating has fallen off. The competition for admission has not been as keen. We have seen times when we have admitted all who qualified, and the result was that a smaller number continued through to graduation.

It is hard to interpret the figures exactly—whether the change

was due to less ability on the part of the freshmen or to increased difficulties due to the financial situation which caused many to drop out, is a question.

We give in the Annual Report the usual data as to our enrolment, and one other thing similar to that explained by the other speakers. We list in the report every institution from which we received students during the last three years and give the number coming, large or small, as it may be, and the percentage of that number that made a satisfactory record—meaning by that a C average during their first year—and the average grade point rating for all that group of students. That applies to universities, colleges, junior colleges, and high schools.

You might say it is pitiless publicity because any institution from which students have come to us can at once see the relative success of their students. It does not mean anything, of course, when there are only one or two students, but for larger numbers I think the record is significant. We rank these institutions within their own groups on a percentile basis if as many as five students have come during the period. This, of course, is less important in the case of transfers from universities than in case of transfers from the junior colleges; there the figures are often very illuminating. If any of you are interested in seeing our experience with seventy or eighty junior colleges, we shall be glad to give it to you in the form of a copy of this report.

Always, of course, those figures have to be taken with some judgment. It is impossible to make a mathematical rating of a school. There is always a lag in figures of this type. Before we get a year's record we are comparing that record with work done two or three years previously, and conditions may have changed in the school or college from which those students have come. To say a school today stands 18th on a list may not be fair, because that goes back to students who were there some years ago. Conditions may be better or worse than that number indicates. So there is always an element of uncertainty in data of this sort, but it is the best that is available.

When it comes to high schools, we used to rank them all together. There is always, as you know, a curious difference in the standing of private schools and public schools. Of course, that is an old topic of discussion. Why is it that, in our data, the graduates of the private schools, which have had superior opportunities, on the whole,

show a poorer college achievement than those coming from public schools? I think I am right in saying that this is almost a universal experience, and it is a puzzle. There are various answers suggested for it. I need not go into them now. The comparison is not fair, because I think the answers go back into the social conditions, financial conditions, etc. So we have begun now to segregate the private schools and compare them with one another, and the public schools with one another. Whatever factors there may be there, are thus eliminated.

For example, I have picked one of the public schools at random. They sent seven students over a five-year period. Their grade-point ratio was 2.76 and the percentile rank was 75. That discloses at once to the school, to the trustees of the school, to the students, and possibly future students, the success of this group from that particular institution. We send a copy of the report to every school named in it every year, so that there is reasonable distribution of that information.

I think those are the most important things we do as far as distribution of this type of information to people not connected with the University is concerned. I think conditions differ a little in the state institution drawing largely from its own state, and of necessity maintaining very close relationships with the schools of that state.

One other point has been mentioned and that is the distribution to the faculty of the grades given by different courses or different departments. We have done very little of that. It has been done and it has shown, of course, the great variations and the inconsistencies that one always finds in such studies. We have adopted a guiding distribution of grades to the extent that the faculty has recommended that this be taken as a base for the assignment of grades in all excepting small and advanced classes, and we have compiled the results, and have a notion about how the faculty is going with respect to that suggestion. They are not holding to it rigidly; they are giving more good grades and fewer lower grades than the distribution calls for.

I have had some hesitancy in pressing that very hard because I feel that those distribution ideas are all right up to a certain point, but they require some caution. As far as I have seen, in the recommended distribution of grades worked out by any group, they have not taken into account two very important things. One is the effect of continuing courses. Suppose, for example, you have French I

and French II. Your grade distribution of French I is a certain proportion of A's and B's and C's and D's. That is perfectly all right. But when it comes to French II, you are dealing with the survivors of French I and you should not have the same distribution. Supposedly a good many of the poorer students have been weeded out and it may be logical to have a larger number of better grades in the second half. Another factor that is overlooked is that usually these systems are adopted for the whole institution. Obviously it should not be the same for juniors and seniors as it is for freshmen and sophomores, if the grading system is working—if we are weeding out a certain proportion of the poor students at the bottom. If the juniors and seniors are the more or less tested survivors, we should get a larger proportion of A's and B's. There might be a class where all deserved either A or B. Those factors coming into the picture make me a little hesitant about pressing too far this question of distribution of grades according to a recommended system. Of course, there are obvious cases where something ought to be done about it. When you find a certain course giving 90 per cent A's and B's, that is ludicrous and some method ought to be found, I think, to control such cases, but it is pretty hard to find any way to do it effectively.

I think the way suggested at the University of Michigan is probably the best of all ways to go about it. By giving the facts and letting nature take its course, generally speaking those things do improve. Mr. Armsby spoke of how the variations were flattening out. I think that is the logical result of that type of work and it is very highly desirable.

GRADE PUBLICITY SERVICE BY THE REGISTRAR

MARIAN WILLIAMS

In a very authentic-looking dictionary I find the registrar defined merely as a "keeper of records," with no mention at all of his ever being expected to function in the capacity of "dispenser of data." It is with some apprehension, therefore, before a gathering made up almost entirely of registrars that I overlook completely how the records are kept and devote all of the time to the discussion of how grade information may be given away to the faculty, the high school, and the student.

Whether the grade distribution is normal or skewed or based upon 5 or 100 measures for student achievement, it is the task of the registrar to extract whatever it contains of educational nourishment and make use of it in mixing up a few tonics. With his concoctions he must arouse the "capable idler," encourage the high school principal to apply corrective medicine where it is necessary, and incite the college professor to take note of whether the "failures" are too numerous or the "excellents" are being passed about too generously in his department.

Since the speaker is best informed about the situation at the University of Michigan, illustrations showing the type of grade information dispensed and to whom it is distributed are taken from that institution, but it is hoped that a general discussion may bring out the practices and benefits elsewhere.

The first grade report which the Registrar receives for the freshman after he is actually on the campus is that obtained from the results of the two examinations he is required to take during Orientation Period, one psychological and the other English. The grades from these tests, which have been given for the last nine years, are used by the English faculty as an aid for sectioning, and the members of this department have expressed confidence that this is a real service, since it gives the individuals of exceptional ability an opportunity to develop to their full capacity and the inferior students the advantage of closer supervision.

The results of these tests also serve as a beacon to direct the guidance of the freshmen by the advisers along more helpful channels, supplementing the personal history, teacher rating, and high school scholastic record information contained in our application blank. In all cases where the test scores are in the lowest 25 per cent, the adviser is requested to get in touch with the students for conferences relative to possible difficulties with freshman work. For all students in the lowest 50 per cent, it is suggested that the adviser refrain from informing the student too fully of this fact but make more general observations to the effect that there are indications which call for steady application and careful planning of work.

About two weeks after the opening of the semester, the results of these examinations are sent back to the principal for his inspection and comparison with the high school evaluation of the student. In 1935, these reports were distributed to the 652 high schools represented in the freshman class. From the acknowledgments sent

to us by the various principals, I have selected a rather typical reply which shows that the service is appreciated by them and that they are using the reports to good advantage. This principal writes:

Thanks for the records of our boys in their freshman examinations. I have studied them with much interest. The results correspond very closely to what we knew of them here. They also confirm me in my belief that more should be done with boys of their type in reading, vocabulary work, and spelling.

Replies of this sort are fairly numerous and, although it is difficult to obtain a definite measure of the benefits growing out of this service, it is felt, because of these comments from the principals, that the check which it gives the high schools is appreciated.

In the same letter which contains the test scores is an invitation to the principals to come to the University in November, after five weeks of University work have been completed. At this time they are guests for luncheon and, during the day, are given the opportunity to meet their former pupils and discuss with them individually for about fifteen minutes their work, living conditions, and problems of adjustment. For these conferences, the Registrar places the five-week grade reports and comments from members of the faculty at the disposal of the principals. This service was inaugurated in 1927, when fourteen Detroit high schools were represented. It has been used by more principals each year until sixty-nine schools sent representatives in 1935. Aside from the fact that the number of principals attending has increased so rapidly, have we any other means of determining the degree of benefit derived from these conferences, and might not the rapid rise in attendance be attributed to the culinary powers of the local chef as well as to the growing appreciation of the value of the contact? We think the answer is found in the letters sent back by the principals after these meetings. Portions of these letters, which are included as evidence, reflect the shortcomings in one case of high school and in the other of University instruction. One principal tells us:

I find that we need to make two changes in our course of study, both of which we have already planned to make. We found that each one of our pupils was experiencing more or less difficulty with beginning mathematics and beginning English.

To remedy this situation, we are planning a course in English composition and a course in review mathematics in 12 A. We feel that such a course will be valuable for pupils planning to attend the University and also for those expecting to go into industry and business.

Another principal gives us the following pertinent information:

The boys who are taking geometry from "Mr. Jones" said that he is far from a good teacher. The general criticism of him was that he was a very brilliant student of mathematics himself but he was impatient and sarcastic when pupils in his classes were unable to understand the problems as he felt they should.

They spoke very highly of "Mr. Brown" who seemed to be the sort of instructor to whom they felt free to go for advice. Our boys said that he worked with them to try to get them on their feet and started in the right way, and that he seemed to be very approachable so that the boys could go to him for conferences. I mention this because "Mr. Brown" may be able to work in with your scheme of guidance in some way. By the comments our people made, he is very interested in his students.

The uncomplimentary remarks in this letter were passed on to the head of the department concerned as an anonymous contribution and, since no further complaints have been received, we assume that the situation has been taken care of satisfactorily. The Counselor to New Students was given the information about "Mr. Brown's" apparent aptitude for guidance work. While most of the letters from the principals are not quite so specific in their criticism or praise, valuable suggestions have been made, and we feel that both the high school and the University profit by these conferences.

Another grade report to the high schools is made at the close of the first semester, when the final semester grades earned by their students are sent back to the principals of each of the high schools, together with a sheet showing the average grade for each freshman course (Table I). By comparing the grades earned by his students in each subject with the grade-point averages for all students in those subjects, the principal is able to judge the performance of his students in relation to that of the entire first-year group and to see whether they have measured up to the standard they are capable of reaching. In a few cases the principal has sent back a comment which, when followed up by the advisers, has corrected some maladjustment and resulted in much more satisfactory work on the part of the student during the second semester. However, in general, immediate returns are not to be expected, and we have no positive measure of the effectiveness of this service. We do know that all of these contacts have helped to build up a closer relationship between the high school and the University.

The Registrar is one doctor who stands ready to take his own doses and, as these reports go back to the high schools, he compares

the performance of the group with his prediction at entrance of their success, based upon the information in the application blank and an insight gained through long years of service. He also sees that the grades are posted to cards by high schools, and that a study of the number of satisfactory and unsatisfactory students from each

TABLE I
GRADE POINT AVERAGES FOR ALL STUDENTS IN THE UNIVERSITY
ENROLLED IN COURSES NORMALLY PURSUED BY FRESHMEN
FIRST SEMESTER, 1934-35

COURSE	COURSE NUMBER	GRADE POINT AVERAGE*	COURSE	COURSE NUMBER	GRADE POINT AVERAGE*	
Architecture	1	2.7	German	31	2.6	
	2a	3.0		32	2.3	
	2b	3.3	Greek	1	2.8	
	2c	3.0		31	3.7	
	2d	2.6	History	11	2.4	
Botany	1	2.4		Latin	1	2.7
	Chemistry	3	2.1		3	2.6
5		2.2	5	3.2		
5E		2.2	7	3.0		
Drawing	1	2.6	Mathematics	1	2.3	
	21	2.8		2	2.6	
Education	F 5a	2.5		3	2.1	
	F 5b	2.5	4	2.0		
	F41	2.6	5	2.2		
	F41a	2.9	6	2.4		
	F41b	2.4	7	2.0		
	English	1	2.2	8	2.2	
2 (L., S., and A. Music and Education)		1.9	Military Science	1	2.6	
2 (Engineering Architecture and Pharmacy)			Music B	B1	2.5	
French	1	2.5	Pharmacy	B2	2.0	
	2	2.4	1	2.7		
	31	2.7	Physics	35	2.2	
	32	2.4	Political Science	1	2.2	
	Geography	1	2.5	Shop	2	2.5
		11	2.2	Spanish	1	2.6
1		2.2	2	2.4		
German	1	2.2	31	2.7		
	2	1.9	32	3.2		
			Zoology	1	2.3	
			Total		2.3	
A		B	C	D	E	Total
Total Semester Hours	3,745	9,087	13,884	3,217	1,469	31,402
Per Cent	11.9	28.9	44.2	10.2	4.7	

* Cases of incomplete work and failure of the instructor to report a grade were disregarded in making these calculations. The following scale was used:

- A—Excellent—4 points
- B—Good —3 points
- C—Fair —2 points
- D—Passed —1 point
- E—Failure —0 points

school is made. The first table of this sort, covering five years' experience, was published in 1934-35. Since educational conditions in the high school and the University are constantly changing, it is doubtful whether experience covering longer than a five-year period is of any value as a factor in prediction. From most high schools, data for this limited period are far too meager to be reliable for use

in prophesying success or failure of the student. It is anticipated that, for the most part, this table will serve merely to show the

TABLE II
STUDY OF FRESHMAN GRADES
SEPTEMBER ADMISSIONS

SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES	STU- DENTS GRADED	SEMESTER HOURS							GRADE POINT AVER- AGE*
		A	B	C	D	E	I & X	TOTAL	
First Semester, 1934-35									
L., S., and A. %	1,047	1,509 9.7	4,108 26.4	7,381 47.4	1,487 9.5	818 5.2	280 1.8	15,583	2.26
Engineering %	276	530 12.0	1,325 30.0	1,675 37.9	582 13.2	257 5.8	55 1.2	4,424	2.30
Architecture %	22	58 17.3	133 39.7	101 30.1	14 4.2	16 4.8	13 3.9	335	2.63
Pharmacy %	10	11 7.2	35 23.0	70 46.1	25 16.4	8 5.3	3 2.0	152	2.11
Dental Hygiene %	14	12 5.7	70 33.3	124 59.0	4 1.9	0	0	210	2.43
Education %	25	23 6.4	65 18.0	188 52.1	67 18.6	18 5.0	0	361	2.02
Music %	30	78 17.7	126 28.6	181 41.1	20 4.5	16 3.6	19 4.3	440	2.54
Total %	1,424	2,221 10.3	5,862 27.3	9,720 45.2	2,199 10.2	1,133 5.3	370 1.7	21,505	2.28
Second Semester, 1934-35									
L., S., and A. %	973	1,415 9.8	4,220 29.3	6,654 46.2	1,296 9.0	486 3.4	340 2.4	14,411	2.34
Engineering %	267	621 14.7	1,196 28.2	1,542 36.4	484 11.4	278 6.6	113 2.7	4,234	2.34
Architecture %	20	41 13.4	100 32.7	112 36.6	35 11.4	15 4.9	3 1.0	306	2.39
Pharmacy %	9	30 23.1	20 15.4	50 38.5	25 19.2	0	5 3.8	130	2.44
Dental Hygiene %	14	6 2.3	63 23.7	174 65.4	23 8.6	0	0	266	2.20
Education %	23	20 5.8	61 17.7	172 49.9	50 14.5	38 11.0	4 1.2	345	1.93
Music %	27	61 15.7	129 33.2	134 34.5	17 4.4	10 2.6	37 9.5	388	2.61
Total %	1,333	2,194 10.9	5,789 28.8	8,838 44.0	1,930 9.6	827 4.1	502 2.5	20,080	2.34

* The scale for figuring averages is A = 4; B = 3; C = 2; D = 1; E = 0; I and X disregarded.

various schools what the performance of their group has been in relation to that of the other groups.

The final grade broadcast to the high schools is made at the close of the year through a table appearing in the Registrar's yearly

report (Table II), showing by semesters all grades earned by freshmen during their first year in the University. This grade report has been sent out for nine consecutive years, and the principals now look forward to receiving it for purposes of comparison. These nine years show us that there is some fluctuation in the performance of the freshman group (Table III). In every year the second-

TABLE III
FRESHMAN GRADES

YEAR	SEMESTER	PER CENT						TOTAL HOURS	GRADE POINT AVERAGE*
		A	B	C	D	E	IX		
1926-27	1st	<i>9.2†</i>	<i>26.0</i>	42.5	13.9	<i>7.6</i>	.8	22,035	2.16
	2nd	10.5	27.4	43.0	13.3	5.2	.6	19,889	2.25
1927-28	1st	10.4	26.3	42.4	13.0	6.5	1.4	19,481	2.21
	2nd	11.5	27.7	41.3	12.6	5.6	1.3	17,842	2.27
1928-29	1st	9.3	27.3	42.0	13.3	6.5	1.6	18,571	2.20
	2nd	12.0	29.6	41.9	11.2	4.1	1.2	16,461	2.35
1929-30	1st	9.3	26.1	41.4	<i>14.4</i>	6.8	2.1	22,136	2.17
	2nd	10.9	27.2	43.9	12.5	4.0	1.5	19,668	2.29
1930-31	1st	11.3	27.4	42.1	12.0	6.2	1.0	19,360	2.26
	2nd	13.7	<i>30.6</i>	<i>39.8</i>	10.0	4.0	1.9	17,639	2.41
1931-32	1st	11.9	28.3	41.9	11.7	4.8	1.5	17,240	2.31
	2nd	12.7	29.4	41.8	10.6	<i>3.6</i>	2.0	16,248	2.38
1932-33	1st	11.2	29.5	43.8	10.5	4.2	.8	15,536	2.33
	2nd	<i>14.2</i>	29.5	41.4	8.5	3.9	2.5	15,063	2.43
1933-34	1st	11.3	29.1	43.3	10.6	4.8	.9	19,127	2.32
	2nd	12.8	30.2	43.0	<i>8.2</i>	4.6	1.1	17,850	2.39
1934-35	1st	10.3	27.3	<i>45.2</i>	10.2	5.3	1.7	21,505	2.28
	2nd	10.9	28.8	44.0	9.6	4.1	2.5	20,080	2.34
1926-35	1st	10.4	27.4	42.7	12.2	5.9	1.3	174,991	2.24
	2nd	12.0	28.9	42.3	10.8	4.4	1.6	160,740	2.34

*A—4 points
B—3 points
C—2 points
D—1 point
E—0 points

†Maximum and minimum percentages for each grade are printed in italics.

semester averages are higher than the first, due to some extent to the first-semester failures who are requested by the Disciplinary Committee to leave. In 1926-27 the freshman group gave an unusually poor performance with grade-point averages of 2.16 and 2.25, and in 1932-33 entrants did especially well with 2.33 the first semester and 2.43 the second semester.

The second type of grade-publicity service which the Registrar gives is that to the student organizations. Except in instances where the individual groups request reports during the year, no account-

ing is made until the close. At this time, a scholarship chart* showing the general groups and each fraternity, sorority, dormitory, and League house in its relative position on a percentage scale is made up and mailed to each group, from the Registrar's office. At the same time another sheet* covering twelve years' experience for each fraternity and showing its relation to the other groups is mailed from the office of the Dean of Students both to the local chapters and to the national headquarters of each group. The work sheets upon which these charts are based are made up in the Registrar's office from tabulating machine cards.* On these sheets, by machine methods, the name of each student, the number of hours of each grade earned by semesters, and the average for the entire group appear. These are kept on file in the Registrar's office, and the leaders of the groups are urged to call and examine the record and to commend any of their members who have contributed greatly to their success and to assist those who have been responsible for the failure of the chapter. This is not compulsory and approximately half of the groups respond. Those who do are painstaking in their examination of the reports and appreciative of the service.

In an attempt to check to some extent the value of this service as a stimulus to the student to put forth his best effort, we have asked the various representatives to explain briefly what use was made of the information. In some cases, superior students were given some sort of material reward, such as a book or ring; in other instances, they were granted certain privileges not allowed mediocre and inferior students. Inferior students are penalized by the restriction of dates, enforcement of additional study hours, etc. For the fraternity maintaining the highest scholastic record during the year, a silver loving cup has been donated by one of the fraternity groups. The Registrar is responsible for seeing that the winning fraternity has its name and the year inscribed on the side of the cup and that the group is given possession of it for as long as they rank in the top scholastic position. To the sorority ranking at the top, a suitable book is presented each year by the Dean of Women. This is done at a general meeting, usually a banquet, where the Registrar makes a few congratulatory remarks and points out some of the salient features in the scholastic report for the year. Those women students who do not belong to sororities receive similar

* It was not practical to reproduce these forms. The Registrar will be glad to send copies to those who are interested.

recognition through the presentation of a book award to the freshman, sophomore, and junior woman with the highest record during the year, the names of these students being determined in a short time by the Registrar through the use of the tabulating machine cards. It is difficult to measure the amount of benefit derived from this service. It is hoped that it stimulates the student to put forth his best effort. To be sure, there are always some who are willing to sit back and enjoy the view although their own particular contribution constitutes such a blot upon the landscape. In general, interfraternity scholastic rivalry is keen and the position on the scholarship chart, as representing scholastic performance, is a matter of considerable concern to most of the groups. Whether this type of thing should be necessary among college students and does not set up a false standard of values is, of course, open to question.

During the latter part of April of each year, the University sets aside a time for holding a convocation of all students in honor of those freshmen, sophomores, and juniors who have attained an average of at least $\frac{1}{2}$ "A" and $\frac{1}{2}$ "B," seniors who have maintained a "B" average and hold rank in the highest 10 per cent of the graduating class, graduate students eligible for membership in the three honor societies, Phi Beta Kappa, Phi Kappa Phi, and Sigma Xi, and recipients of any special medals and awards. It is the duty of the Registrar to assemble these lists and give out the publicity through the Press, invitations to the students and parents, and the Convocation program. During the year 1934-35, 716 of the total 9,572 students enrolled in the regular session received some sort of honor on the occasion of the Twelfth Annual Honors Convocation. Again, it is difficult to estimate the value of this sort of thing. With so much emphasis placed upon trying to salvage the inferior student, it is rather a welcome diversion for the registrar to devote his energy to preparations for paying homage to the groups who have excelled scholastically.

The last grade-publicity service which I am going to mention is given by the Registrar to the faculty. In 1912-13, Registrar Hall made the first grade study, formally known as such, for the College of Literature, Science, and the Arts. Following that year, the practice seems to have been abandoned until 1924-25, when it was again presented and a comparison made with the 1912-13 distribution of grades. It was continued yearly until 1930-31. At that time, the depression period, when all good universities had to come to the aid of their budgets, it was felt that considerable time and perhaps

too much money was being spent in assembling this sort of information for the amount of benefit derived. In an effort to test the range and value of the grade distribution, a slip was enclosed with each copy sent out, asking the head of the department to indicate whether, in the opinion of the members of the department, the study should be discontinued entirely or repeated at intervals of one, two, three, four, or five years. Some of the heads did not function in this respect but, from the replies received and taking into consideration that the silent were not in all probability overcome with enthusiasm, the general impression gained was that sufficient use was made of the study to justify its continuance at three-year intervals. We had very little check on its use during the time when it was published yearly. Since the change to periodic publication,

TABLE IV
GRADE DISTRIBUTION
COLLEGE OF LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND THE ARTS

YEAR	PER CENT					TOTAL	GRADE AVERAGE*	
	A	B	C	D	E		TOTAL	COURSE I
1912-13	13.2	37.7	37.9	8.2	2.9	20,893	2.50	2.07
1924-25	11.6	34.5	41.0	9.7	3.1	38,340	2.42	2.09
1925-26	11.9	33.1	41.9	10.1	3.1	38,075	2.41	1.89
1926-27	12.2	33.3	41.8	9.8	2.9	40,267	2.42	1.78
1927-28	11.7	34.6	41.3	9.3	3.2	40,679	2.42	2.11
1928-29	12.4	33.7	42.0	9.2	2.7	121,838†	2.44	1.94
1929-30	12.5	33.7	41.8	9.5	2.6	118,609	2.44	1.89
1930-31	13.8	34.3	41.1	8.4	2.4	113,239	2.49	1.96
1933-34	14.2	35.6	40.4	7.4	2.3	103,815	2.52	2.22

* A—4 points; B—3; C—2; D—1; E—0. Incomplete grades have been disregarded.

† Total semester hours.

a number of requests for the information have been received during the years of no issue, and we have been led to believe that many of the faculty members make use of it to the advantage of the department and the students.

To date, the Registrar has merely presented the facts, showing the grades by departments and the general averages. The heads of the divisions have been expected to make comparisons between the averages for their departments and those for the group as a whole and to explain and justify to their own satisfaction any great deviation from the mean. Examination of the reports of the last nine grade studies for the College of Literature, Science, and the Arts (Table V) shows a range in the grade-point average of 2.41 to 2.52, based upon A, 4 points; B, 3 points; etc. One course to which I should like to call attention did not measure up to the general

average throughout the entire time, deviating in a negative direction from the mean. During the nine-year period, while the general grade-point average had a low of 2.41 and a high of 2.52, this course varied from 1.78 to 2.22, never at any time reaching the lowest general average. This course is open to freshmen and requires no previous preparation in the subject. It has a fairly large enrolment, and we have no reason to believe that it is comprised of inferior intellectual material.

It has been expected that departments deviating so far from the mean and unable to explain this departure satisfactorily would of their own accord adopt corrective measures. In most instances this has apparently been done. In the few cases where the deviation from the general average remains consistently large, shall the Registrar start the wheels turning which will transfer indirect guidance into direct pressure? Shall the grade report to the faculty include a definite recommendation that a more or less set curve be followed in grading? Shall we at the same time, through publicity to the high schools and by means of the advisory system, assist the inferior student?

I have tried to present some of the types of grade-publicity service that the Registrar's office at the University of Michigan gives to the high school, the student, and the faculty, not with the idea that they are the best and only methods of improving the scholastic health of the weak and maintaining the vigor of the strong student, but with the hope that the practices outlined here may be approved, rejected, or supplemented for general benefit.

A COMMITTEE ON COLLEGE GRADES

J. R. ROBINSON

Some time ago the faculty at Peabody College had a committee appointed to study the grading situation at Peabody and at other colleges. The committee was instructed to bring back to the faculty with its report its recommendations for improvement of the local grading system. This was not an unusual action for a college to take. In educational magazines one may find almost every week a notice that some college has appointed a committee to study its grading practices with a view to their improvement. Almost every week one hears that some college has made certain modifications in its grading

system. Almost every week registrars get questionnaires from college deans, registrars, or chairmen of committees asking for local grading practices and seeking opinions in regard to various grading systems.

The registrar's office at Peabody had succeeded in making the faculty aware of the situation by means of its reports—reports similar to those which have just been presented to you from the University of Michigan. Occasionally reports of a different character were submitted with a view to bringing out, as vividly as possible, some phases of the situation in certain departments or in certain fields. At the beginning of its study, the committee invited each member of the faculty to give his own explanation and interpretation of the conditions made apparent in these reports. We found these faculty interpretations interesting and enlightening. A number of influences were suggested as having a bearing on the distribution of grades.

The first influence suggested was the character of the student body. Peabody is a college for teachers. There are no athletics or fraternities, and few extra-curricular activities. Most of the students are mature, experienced teachers. They are earnest, have few outside interests, and are self-supporting. They have earned the money that they are now spending in college. Some of them are married and have their families with them. Some are not as intellectual as they might be and some have had gaps in their early training that handicap their present efforts, but there is a general seriousness of purpose. The faculty believes that the presence of this type of student body influences the distribution of grades in two ways. First, it believes that achievement is somewhat greater than it would be with a student body of the same ability but without the maturity, experience, and the motivation that this student body has. Second, it believes that there is tendency for higher grades to be given to this type of student for the same achievement than to a younger type of student without experience. In other words, the mature, experienced student is likely to get grades slightly higher than his actual achievement deserves.

Another thing that probably affects the distribution of grades at Peabody is the attitude of the faculty towards grades. Years ago the faculty agreed that emphasis on grades should be reduced to a minimum and attempts were made to prevent students from working consciously for grades. The faculty felt that it was undesirable

for students to compare grades, that this would cause jealousies and misunderstandings. It was probably difficult for instructors to justify specific marks when asked to do so by dissatisfied students. In order to reduce emphasis on the acquirement of grades to a minimum, the faculty decided that the student should not be told what his grades were. When a student makes a grade of F or D he must be told because there are penalties involved, but if his grades are higher than these he does not know whether they are A's, B's, or C's. It was thought that this would free the student from grade consciousness and enable him to work in a course for what the course had to offer rather than for the mark that he would receive. It probably has had some such effect. It was thought also that this would free the instructor from student bickering, pleading, and arguing; that it would free him from attempting impossible distinctions in marking and yet would set him free to assign grades as best he could without being subject to undue student influence.

A factor that has affected the distribution of grades, according to different members of the faculty, is the need that certain departments have for students. There is a suspicion that some of the departments that need students most are least careful in assigning grades; either that, or they have a much higher type of student than the larger departments. This is not true of all small departments but it seems to be true of some of them.

Another influence that has affected the distribution of grades is the special meanings that have been assigned to certain marks from time to time by the faculty. The meaning that a mark had at one time we find has been changed by assigning penalties to it. For example, the grade of D was at one time assigned to approximately 20 per cent of the student body. Then the faculty became concerned because so many students who had received grades of D or F were getting degrees. It was decided that something should be done about it, so a number of rules were adopted. It is not necessary to state these rules in detail because they are somewhat involved, but it was provided that a student who made a very poor record in any one quarter would not be allowed to reregister in the institution. Those who made better records, but still poor, found themselves subject to a number of penalties. No credit, of course, was assigned for a grade of F. Only limited credit was given for a grade of D. With either grade the student's load for the succeeding quarter was

materially reduced. With a mature student body this is a real penalty as each student wants to accomplish as much as possible each quarter he is in attendance. At registration students who have made a grade of D are required to file by what is popularly known as the "flunk box" and have the poor records placed prominently on their registration cards in red ink. The fact that poor grades have been made is thus brought prominently to the attention of any members of the teaching faculty or administration with whom the student comes in contact during the registration period. It is brought to the attention of any students that happen to be in his vicinity while registering. The amount of credit for a D grade is reduced and the fractional amount always stands out prominently on his record. Consequently, the D grade at Peabody does not have the meaning now that it formerly had. It has approached so closely to an F that the grade of D at Peabody has all but disappeared. Instructors dealing with a group that in former times would have been assigned a grade of D are inclined to give those in the lower half of the group a grade of F and those in the upper half C-. There is not much difference between a D+ and a C-; if a student deserves a low D, he might as well be given F since a D gives only partial credit.

A somewhat similar situation has come about with regard to the grade of C for graduate students. Formerly graduate students were assigned the grades of A, B, and C. The faculty became concerned about its standards. Too many graduate students of C caliber were receiving master's degrees. So, the faculty, without much previous study, passed a resolution that henceforth no student would receive graduate credit for a C grade. A study made after this faculty action was taken showed that only about 3 per cent of those that had received the master's degree at Peabody had graduated without any C grades. The study showed that grades of C had been assigned rather generously to our most outstanding alumni. We respected these alumni. We respected them as students as well as teachers and administrative officers. Under the new rule it became necessary for an instructor to assign a grade of B, or fail the student. Most instructors felt that there were students who had done work in graduate classes satisfactorily but not excellently, work that they had been in the habit of defining as C grade work. Some of these students were failed under the new ruling. In the main, however,

instructors insisted that the student had passed and felt that they could not in justice deny the student graduate credit. Since B was the lowest passing mark, a B was assigned.

From these experiences the faculty learned two things. First, any special meaning given to a mark by attaching to it a reward or a penalty affects the distribution of that mark and interferes with its use as a measure of achievement. The more severe the penalty the more the meaning of the mark is changed, and hence the greater the disturbance in the normal use of the mark as a measure of achievement. The second thing we learned from these experiences is that the standards of an institution are not affected by the grading system. Standards can not be raised or lowered by a mere mechanical system of grading any more than a thermometer can raise the temperature of a room. The thermometer records more or less accurately the room temperature. It is affected by the temperature, but the temperature is not affected by the thermometer. The passing mark of a college can not be changed by faculty resolution. The passing mark and the standards of an institution reside in the minds and hearts and ideals of the faculty. They change very slowly. No mere resolution or mechanical system of grading has any real effect whatever. What the faculty really did that day was to change the symbol which represented the passing mark. The passing mark itself remained where it had been.

Some of the members of the committee had rather decided notions about what a grading system should be, but it was believed that no grading system would be successful unless the teaching faculty fully understood it and believed in it. It was decided, therefore, to obtain the views of the faculty as fully as possible. This was done by a questionnaire accompanied by full reports and discussions. This was supplemented by personal interviews with as many of the faculty as possible. We found that the faculty were agreed unanimously on only one point; none of them was satisfied with the grading system we had. On other points it was not always clear just what the faculty as a whole did want or believe, but there was general agreement that grading should not be according to any uniform curve; grading should not be by ranking students; and that marks should be assigned on the basis of achievement only. There was also an agreement that there should be a modification of the rules regarding grades of D and C.

And so the committee submitted a report designed to conform as

far as possible to the expressed wishes of the faculty. We realize that we have not solved the grading situation. In a way we have merely patched up the system we had. We feel that we have accomplished something in arousing the interest of every member of the faculty in the problem of grades. We fully expect that the faculty, in a year or two, will appoint another committee, instructed to study grades and to bring in its recommendations for improvement. We shall be disappointed if this does not happen. The Registrar's office is determined that it will happen, and to this end is committing itself to the task of providing for the faculty continued studies and reports dealing with the distribution of grades in the college.

PRESENT OBSTACLES TO THE COMPARABILITY OF GRADES OF DIFFERENT INSTITUTIONS

ALVAN E. DUERR

The registrars have been so generous in their co-operation with the fraternities, and have been so willing to assume an enormous amount of work in order to make reports of the scholarship of fraternities available, that any criticism of prevailing methods seems an unwarranted expression of ingratitude. But what I am saying is not prompted by any lack of appreciation; but rather by a desire to point out some of the obstacles which stand in the way of our achieving the real objective which you had in mind when you assumed this work.

There is an almost infinite variety of marking systems in the country, and each is based upon some clearly defined idea of mathematical justice, assuming that there is such a thing. And each system expresses adequately, and with reasonable justice, what a given institution thinks of the academic output of a given individual or group of individuals. And that is all that the institution hopes to attain. Consequently, the institution's system, whatever it is, is satisfactory, and is beyond challenge.

When the marks of a group of men from that institution are compared with the marks of other groups in the same institution, all are measured with the same yardstick, and all are therefore treated alike and with reasonable justice. It is only when we compare groups in one institution with groups in another that any serious inequity appears; and it is far from reasonable to ask the

University of Michigan to change its marking system merely because a fraternity group at the University of California suffers in its comparative ranking because of some discrepancy between the two systems employed.

On the other hand, there are fundamental principles involved, and it is not amiss to point them out. The whole trend in evaluating the academic output of the student has been in the direction of getting away from the absolute and the positive. We have recognized the folly of assuming that the mathematical hairline between 74.999 and 75.000 represents the difference between the man who is entitled to credit for work done and the man who must spend another semester on the same job. As a result we are making less tangible and absolute our measurement of the intangible, and are assigning what might be called group or quality grades indicating *excellent, good, fair, passing, conditioned, failing*. As an indication of the real objective this is not only not mathematical but also it defies mathematics, and the pity is that we have to reduce it to a mathematical basis, for that is where the trouble arises.

Of the institutions which have adopted some such system as this, and have substituted for the old percentage system a series of letters—A, B, C, D, E, and F, we find again an almost inexhaustible variety, for we have not yet found the courage to reject specific labels altogether, and adopt the English system of *honors, gentleman's grade, and sequestration*, or returning to father for additional momentum. We must give to each of these general descriptions a specific value.

Among the institutions represented in your association, A receives the following values: 100, 98, 97.5, 97, 96, 95, 45.99, 45, 16, 12, 10, 7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2.5, 2, 1, and .5. Where A equals 100 and B 90, A is 11 per cent more valuable than B; does that represent accurately the difference in effort required? If B is given a value of 85, the difference becomes 17.5 per cent and this discrepancy is reflected in the average and in the resulting index with the variation in the distribution of A's and B's. If A equals 5 and B 4, the difference is 25 per cent; if A equals 4 and B 3, 33 per cent; and if A equals 3 and B 2, 50 per cent. All this is important when we compare records of groups in such differing institutions.

But the most serious discrepancy arises from the fact that among the institutions using the 3, 2, 1 system, A=3, B=2, C=1, D (passing)=0, E=0, and F=0; but some institutions carry on the

good work by assigning minus values to E and F, either -1 for each or $E = -1$ and $F = -2$. In any one institution this is immaterial, but it makes real comparisons with other institutions impossible, unless they too use the negative values, and as we shall see later, the actual difference here becomes readily apparent.

In order to illustrate graphically the several points to which I have been calling your attention, I have taken an actual fraternity scholarship report computed by an institution which has some 500 men and 10 fraternities. This institution assigns A, B, C, D, and E to work done in individual courses, and in computing averages weights these letters with numerical values on the scale of 100. Its fraternity scholarship report, as submitted to us, reads as follows:

(a)	1. Alpha	82.64	+23
	2. Beta	80.63	+14
	3. Gamma	80.25	+12
	4. Delta	80.17	+12
	5. Epsilon	79.71	+10
	6. Zeta	79.38	+ 8
	7. <i>All fraternities</i>	78.76	+ 5
	8. Eta	78.36	+ 3
	9. Theta	77.95	+ 2
	10. <i>All men</i>	77.70	0
	11. Iota	77.20	- 3
	12. Kappa	74.17	-16

It will be remembered that the system which we have adopted for reducing reports from different institutions to a common denominator, takes the *all men's average* as the base, gives it a value of zero (0), and arrives at the index by computing a differential, which is obtained by dividing the difference between the *all men's average* and the highest mark obtainable by 100, giving us in effect 100 steps between the *all men's average* and perfection. It becomes evident at once that the length of the step will vary with both the *all men's average* and the highest mark obtainable, and that at once we have a serious irregularity if two systems are in every way identical but one considers 100 the maximum mark while the other takes 95 or even 90. Let us now choose arbitrarily five of the various methods in use for weighting the values of A, B, C, D, E, and F, and see what the effect is on this scholarship report, remembering that in the above report—(a)—the Greek sequence of letters cor-

responds to the order of excellence, and that in subsequent variations of this report the same Greek letter indicates the same original group or fraternity.

(b) $A=3, B=2, C=1, D=0, E=0, F=0$:

1. Alpha	1.681	+20
2. Beta	1.556	+13
3. Epsilon	1.378	+ 2
4. Zeta	1.367	+ 1
5. <i>All men</i>	1.355	0
6. Gamma	1.350	- 1
7. Delta	1.337	- 2
8. <i>All fraternities</i>	1.273	- 5
9. Eta	1.240	- 7
10. Theta	1.067	-28
11. Kappa	.762	-37
12. Iota	.684	-41

(c) $A=3, B=2, C=1, D=0, E=-1, F=-1$:

1. Alpha	1.618	+18
2. Beta	1.556	+14
3. Zeta	1.353	+ 2
4. Epsilon	1.351	+ 2
5. Gamma	1.350	+ 2
6. <i>All men</i>	1.330	0
7. Delta	1.279	- 4
8. <i>All fraternities</i>	1.227	- 7
9. Eta	1.200	- 8
10. Theta	.933	-24
11. Kappa	.667	-40
12. Iota	.579	-46

(d) $A=3, B=2, C=1, D=0, E=-1, F=-2$:

1. Alpha	1.591	+17
2. Beta	1.556	+15
3. Gamma	1.350	+ 3
4. Zeta	1.347	+ 2
5. Epsilon	1.346	+ 2
6. <i>All men</i>	1.315	0
7. Delta	1.244	- 5
8. <i>All fraternities</i>	1.206	- 7

9. Eta	1.184	- 8
10. Theta	.893	-26
11. Kappa	.600	-43
12. Iota	.526	-47

(e) A=4, B=3, C=2, D=1, E=0, F=0: (Same as (c))

(f) A=5, B=4, C=3, D=2, E=1, F=0: (Same as (d))

Let us now apply the method employed by some institutions which use letters for both individual marks and individual averages, but weight them on the scale of 100 when computing group averages. Taking the values used by one specific institution, our report now reads:

(g)	1. Alpha	82.43	+20
	2. Beta	80.55	+12
	3. Zeta	79.03	+ 5
	4. Epsilon	78.99	+ 5
	5. Delta	78.91	+ 4
	6. <i>All fraternities</i>	78.44	+ 2
	7. <i>All men</i>	78.09	0
	8. Eta	78.01	- 1
	9. Gamma	78.75	- 2
	10. Theta	76.69	- 7
	11. Kappa	74.69	-16
	12. Iota	74.17	-18

The variation in the ranking of individual fraternities in this identical report computed by the different methods indicated, is shown in the following table:

	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(g)
1. Alpha	1	1	1	1	1
2. Beta	2	2	2	2	2
3. Gamma	3	6	5	3	9
4. Delta	4	7	7	7	5
5. Epsilon	5	3	4	5	4
6. Zeta	6	4	3	4	3
7. <i>All fraternities</i>	7	8	8	8	6
8. Eta	8	9	9	9	8
9. Theta	9	10	10	10	10
10. <i>All men</i>	10	5	6	6	7
11. Iota	11	12	12	12	12
12. Kappa	12	11	11	11	11

The variation in indices is shown in the following table:

	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(g)
1. Alpha	+23	+20	+18	+17	+20
2. Beta	+14	+13	+14	+15	+12
3. Gamma	+12	- 1	+ 2	+ 3	- 2
4. Delta	+12	- 2	- 4	- 5	+ 4
5. Epsilon	+10	+ 2	+ 2	+ 2	+ 5
6. Zeta	+ 8	+ 1	+ 2	+ 2	+ 5
7. <i>All fraternities</i>	+ 5	- 5	- 7	- 7	+ 2
8. Eta	+ 3	- 7	- 8	- 8	- 1
9. Theta	+ 2	-18	-24	-26	- 7
10. <i>All men</i>	0	0	0	0	0
11. Iota	- 3	-41	-46	-47	-18
12. Kappa	-16	-37	-40	-43	-16

The unusual variation between (a) and (b) in indices is undoubtedly due to the fact that the institution whose marks we have taken for comparison has a relatively high numerical value for D, E, and F, making it possible under (a) for a chapter which had 16 per cent B's, 42 per cent C's, and 42 per cent D's, to stand just half a point below the *all men's average*. But when we convert these A, B, C's into 3, 2, 1, we find that a D reduces a B to a C, and thus the chapter finds itself at -41 instead of -3. The difference is almost inconceivable, but entirely logical. Other apparent inconsistencies are due to the fact that where the progression in weighted values is not regular any unusual distribution among the different categories will effect a radical relative difference in the final averages.

In these various versions of the same report the *all fraternity average* shifts from +5 to -7. This is rather startling, because it simply means that if some of the institutions whose fraternities are notoriously low in scholarship were to change their marking system with discretion, they might by that simple device improve the scholarship of their fraternity men materially. In the fraternity scholarship survey for 1934-35, there were 34 institutions out of the 163 included at which the average of *all fraternities* was higher than +5, and only 11 at which it was lower than -7; it would then seem that by a mere change of marking systems any one of you could bring the fraternities of your campus from 152nd out of 163 to 35th, an improvement of 117 places. Or, if all the fraternity men of the country were marked under (c), where they average -7,

we could effect a 12 point rise to +5, without calling on them for a bit more of mental effort, merely by shifting our marking system to (a). If this seemed too sudden a transition and reformation, we could take the journey more leisurely (to (b), to (g), and then to (a)) and make a progression from -7 to -5 to +2 to +5, which would be a scholastic performance that would land the fraternity system of America on the front page of every newspaper.

An analysis of last year's scholarship survey reveals another interesting fact, which may be a mere coincidence, and again may be logical evidence pointing to the same general conclusion: of the institutions which mark on a scale of 100, 67 per cent had last year an *all fraternity average* that was higher than the *all men's average*, while among those employing the 3, 2, 1 method only 44 per cent had a higher fraternity average. Does this mean that the scale of 100 is too favorable, or that the 3, 2, 1 system is too severe? In any event, we may with reason take it for granted that there is much less variation in the significance of an A, B, C, or D as given by a great many different professors in widely separated institutions, than there is in the various methods which have been employed to give mathematical meaning to these letters. And all this means that, far as we have advanced toward a common denominator in terms of which we may translate all reports, we have by no means secured enough uniformity to make any comparison intrinsically fair.

What is to be done about it? We can not hope to succeed in any request that all institutions adopt the same marking system. But we can work toward greater uniformity by establishing a definite ratio between the various steps from *excellent* to *good*, to *credit*, to *passing*, to *condition*, and finally to *failure*. That in itself would reduce to a more reasonable minimum most of the inconsistencies and differences in the above tables.

There is one inconsistency that we meet often and which can be remedied easily. Many institutions weight their letters on a scale of 100, assigning to A values ranging from 85 to 100. But it is manifestly inaccurate to report their maximum mark as 100, when A never receives a weighted value of more than 90, especially when another institution using the same system reports its maximum mark as 90. For instance, in report (a) the maximum mark has been reported as 100, although it should obviously be 95; and if we compute these records on the basis of 95, the indices become +29, +17, +15, +15, +12, +10, +7, +4, +2, 0, -3, -21, a net difference of

15 points; and, incidentally, we have now raised the *all fraternity average* to +7, merely another demonstration of one's ability to perform miracles with figures.

Another obstacle which has stood in the way of maximum accuracy is the failure to give sufficient attention to the number of men in each group. However, our committee has stressed this point during the past two years, and the registrars again have been most generous in their co-operation; so that we are gradually finding it possible to weight semester reports in computing annual averages, and so avoid the inaccuracy which results from allowing a high average made by a group of six men to balance a low average made by a group of thirty-six men. When this practice of reporting the number of men in a chapter becomes universal, our committee can take one more step in the direction of complete accuracy by computing a weighted index for each national fraternity, and thus a more accurately weighted index for all the fraternities of the country. I suspect that the net result of this will be to lower the fraternity index, for the smaller chapters are more often at the top than at the bottom; but, after all, the purpose of our work is to make a dependable statement of fact.

May I call your attention to a problem related to fraternity scholarship reports but with which you are only indirectly concerned? College men are human, and fraternity men are college men, neither the best nor the worst when it comes to a question of ethical standards. The pressure which has been exerted upon chapters to improve their scholarship has undoubtedly resulted in a temptation, at least, to cut certain corners, just as I am sure that if this paper should get into the hands of our undergraduate chapters it would result in propaganda for a discriminating selection of a marking system. One of the simplest ways to improve a chapter's scholastic standing, without too serious encroachment upon the individual's leisure, is to overlook certain indifferent scholars in the chapter when it becomes necessary to report the chapter's membership to the dean or registrar. This has unquestionably been done repeatedly. In the business world it is a serious offense to obtain credit on a concealment of liabilities. The situations are comparable. I can see no advantage to either institution or individual in being too quick to recognize the undergraduate's right to lie merely to serve his own convenience. The penalty for such misrepresentation should be swift and decisive. If I seem to be

stressing this point unduly, let me add that I have in my possession a scholarship report in which the institution gives first place to one of its fraternities, in spite of the fact that its own interfraternity council refused to award the scholarship cup to it on the ground that if the chapter had reported its entire membership it would not have obtained the highest rank.

My entire attention has been devoted in this paper to pointing out weaknesses in our present system of evaluating the academic performance of our fraternity groups. I have done this for constructive reasons. But I should be sorry to leave any impression that we have not traveled far during the last ten years, and that the great work which you have been willing to do has not produced real results. Our system is becoming more accurate each year, and fraternity men are becoming more conscious of college work as a primary obligation. It can no longer be said, no matter what the record of individual fraternity men or of individual chapters may be, that there is an attitude of antagonism to scholarship in the average fraternity house. And that has been accomplished by the simple device of publishing the facts. And that you have made possible.

Fraternity men represent so large a proportion of our undergraduate student bodies, and so influential a one, that it is well worth while to bring them round to a better sense of values in this matter of scholarship and the purpose for which they come to college. If this can be accomplished better by greater uniformity in our marking systems, I am sure that the average institution will gladly abandon pet devices and unusual systems. It is not easy to have a dry spot in a bootlegging community, or clean athletics when all one's competitors are sailing as close to the wind as is practicable regardless of rules. And in the same way, the attitude of the students on any one campus is influenced deeply by the attitude of the many men from other campuses with whom they come into constant contact. That is why this national approach to the scholarship problem has been the only one that would promise ultimately to produce permanent results; and that is why each one of us is justified, and even is called on, to make any necessary concessions and adjustments in order that there may be better rhythm and greater effectiveness in our movement.

Symposium

The Registrar as the Custodian of Standards

ALICE L. BUTLER, CHAIRMAN

STANDARDS IN THE ADMISSION OF FRESHMEN

ARTHUR F. SOUTHWICK

By way of introduction I want to read the description of a registration procedure that is described in a recent popular novel, *Forgive Us Our Trespasses*, by Lloyd C. Douglass. The hero of the story is one Ferdinand Brumm. His entrance to the college of his choice is described as follows:

At length he had reached the impressively business-like, barricaded throne of the Registrar and his self-consciously competent assistants. He answered a few crisp, inquisitorial queries, wrote his name on three or four blanks which were promptly and soundly smacked with a big rubber stamp, counted out forty-two dollars at an adjoining wicket for which he received another emphatic whack on his credentials, moved forward to "Rooms," paid another fee, earned another whack, took his key, picked up the old suitcase he had been pushing along with his foot, and milled through the crowd to the doorway.

Nobody had spoken to him except the perfunctory clerks, nor he to any though there had been a few shy, bucolic grins accompanying the "Beg your pardon" which went along with sundry unintentional jabs of elbows in the jostling line-up of rookies.

They were a very ordinary lot of people, he thought, on both sides of the counter. Those back of the counter were a bit more seasoned, had learned their tricks, had developed something of the arrogance so appropriately worn by petty officials peering through wickets and sourly handing dipped pens to the public for its signature; but there was no essential difference between the green clodhoppers on this side the barrier and the ripe clodhoppers on the other.

As he stood there waiting, Ferdinand wondered if Magnolia wasn't trying to impress the new arrivals; trying to make-believe she was a big university. Where was this warm, home-y friendliness that bubbled on the comradely pages of the college catalogue? Was all this swanky, big-business-y, card-index-y, cash-register-y, atmosphere, this growing fussiness, this official insolence, this elaborate hocus-pocus of labeled wicket-windows, and ostentatious thud of rubber stamps a lot of bunk? His instinct told him the whole affair screamed of insincerity. . . . "Just a friendly, home-y, little college"

This description was written as late as 1932, but fortunately this rubber stamp procedure in registration is rapidly passing. The formal, quantitative type of standard is fast giving way to a more

qualitative and personal approach. This is true both in the realm of accrediting institutions, and in the realm of evaluating the entrance and graduation credentials of the students.

In the discussion of the work of the registrar as the custodian of standards, it is pertinent to review two educational documents, both history making in their influence: the new accrediting procedures of the North Central Association, and the recently published report of the Pennsylvania Study entitled "Variability in Education," prepared by Dr. William S. Learned. Let us take Dr. Learned's study first. You will recall that this study deals with the relation of secondary and higher education in the State of Pennsylvania. The report says, "The most conspicuous fact in every respect of the results of the school and college examinations in Pennsylvania is their variability." A test in general education was given to 1,503 high school seniors, unselected pupils of average quality, and to 3,720 college seniors. Twenty-eight and four-tenths per cent of the college seniors did less well than the average sophomore, and nearly ten per cent did not do as well as the average high school senior. "This means," says the report, "that students classified as sophomores range, as to their command of knowledge appropriate to their status, from a level of absolutely inferior high school achievement to one attained only by the best ten per cent of senior college students." This fact of variability becomes even more conspicuous in the light of the policies and procedures which now prevail in admission and which are designed to bring all students up to certain common standards, such as specified entrance patterns, passing of entrance examinations, or a desired class rank applied to all high schools alike. To quote the report again, "Institutional education, as now conducted, is almost universally a group affair."

It is not necessary to go into the many ramifications of the Pennsylvania Study, but useful to our discussion is a list of the standards that are suggested by the report. In condensed form they are:

1. Student analysis—the attempt by the institution to understand the student and to aid him in analyzing the task of self-education.
2. A worthy educational goal—a plan of education that the student can make a part of himself.
3. A sound, efficient, and sympathetic counseling service.
4. The administration of the institution's material resources,

such as libraries, laboratories, and housing facilities in the interests of the highest personal development of the student.

5. A flexible curriculum by which a student may be impelled to build for himself a vital educational structure.

6. Appraisal of progress. In the light of our past policies of standardization, note this striking statement: "It is not necessary that a college have students of any particular intellectual level; it is its unavoidable duty, however, to ascertain unmistakably and as soon as possible what level of knowledge and ability any given student presents, and then to make it possible for him to progress to the limit of his ascertained powers."

This new point of view of mental diagnosis and the measurement of progress is far off the present beaten track of standardized admission requirements, student classification, and granting of diplomas and degrees largely on a time basis. Recently the Ohio College Association met in Columbus. It was just before Palm Sunday. A department store had in its window a display of boys' suits with a big sign "For Conformation and Graduation"—*con-f-o-r-mation*. There is more truth in the sign painter's error than we care to admit. Too often there is conformation and then graduation.

The Pennsylvania Study points away from the department store type of education. This study is solely an experimental project, but some of its findings are already in operation in the new accrediting standards of the North Central Association. In these standards there are four fundamental principles which are of first concern to the registrar's office. They are:

1. Pre-college guidance. One of the five stated purposes of accrediting is, "To guide prospective students in the choice of an institution of higher education that will meet their needs." The timeliness of this objective of the Association is illustrated by the current discussions of the recruiting problem. At the St. Louis personnel conferences, one session was given over to a program on selective admissions. What happened? The particular admissions program that was described as operative in a certain section of the country proved to be little more than a detailed student recruiting scheme operated through alumni, and the meeting closed with discussions of college competition and high pressure salesmanship.

The North Central Association has rightly set up the needs of students as a first consideration in the high school-college relationship. (The Ohio experiment of co-operative high school-college integration is a step in this direction.)

2. The second fundamental emphasis of the new accrediting requirements encourages individuality among institutions. The institution is called upon to state definitely its objectives, and its facilities and activities will then be judged in terms of the purposes it seeks to serve. The standards recognize that the purposes of higher education are varied and an institution is given the privilege of devoting itself to a limited group of objectives and even ignoring others. In fact, "Uniformity in every detail of institutional policies and practices is believed to be not only unnecessary, but also undesirable." The minimal guarantee that the Association does exact is "the educational process of students to a definite stage of advancement beyond the completion of the usual secondary-school offering."

3. Induction of students. "The policy of an institution in admitting students should be determined on the one hand by the purposes of the institution and on the other by the abilities, interests, and previous preparation of the applicants." This involves the entrance requirements that the college or university may set up and their administration, procedures for comprehensive information about the entering student, and the arrangements for orienting the student to the life and work of the institution.

4. The new requirements stress the need of an adequate student personnel service. This service is expected to touch every phase of the youth's college experience: scholastic development, health, financial affairs, vocational choice and preparation, housing and boarding, and campus activities.

Now where does the registrar come into the picture? We must modestly admit that he is right in the center of it. Under the new regime he is not only the custodian of standards, but also directly and indirectly he becomes the builder and the interpreter of standards. The intangibility of the new requirements and the inadequacy of present means of measuring student abilities and achievements present countless new problems, new opportunities of educational experimentation, and new dangers. Take, for instance, the present trend toward less emphasis upon, or even the setting aside of, the

traditional pattern of entrance units. When a well-established institution long known for high entrance standards sets the pattern aside and uses other valid criteria for the determination of entrance qualifications, that is one thing. But when a weak, struggling institution sets the pattern aside without an adequate substitute for measuring student ability or accomplishment—it is quite another. In the background may lurk the temptation to bolster up a declining enrolment or to increase the enrolment when legislatures hold back on the university budget. There may be the pressure of alumni groups to keep the football team in the winning streak, or even the fond hopes of the faculty that salary cuts may be restored. There is dynamite in the new freedom which the North Central Association has given to its member colleges.

In view of these pressures, the admissions office must fortify itself with valid techniques. Five types of instruments are necessary, some of which we do not yet have:

1. A comparable measure of school achievement—this calls for some system of transmuting marks by which the grades of a student from one school can be compared with those of a student from another school.
2. Tests—intelligence, aptitude, subject placement, vocational interest, personality.
3. A cumulative personnel record.
4. A measure of character qualifications—the C.Q., character quotient.
5. A closer co-ordination of the work of the high school guidance officer and the college counselor.

Certainly there is ample challenge to the present generation of registrars. I grant that the list goes beyond the immediate special topic of standards in the admission of freshmen, but that is exactly the point. Admissions, registration, and personnel can not be separately departmentalized. No longer, under the new regime, will the registrar concern himself solely with entrance units, semester hours, records, rubber stamps, and adding machines. Under the new standards the mind and personality of the student from the time that he first contacts the college until he has made a satisfactory adjustment to life even after graduating, constitute the registrar's field of operations.

STANDARDS OF EVALUATION OF
TRANSFER CREDITS

H. W. CHANDLER

The evaluation of transfer credits is a serious problem for the colleges and universities of this country. In recent years, there has been an increasing tendency among our student population to leave the alma mater and seek new places for educational pursuits.

Transfer students may be classified as legitimate transfers and as migrant transfers. The legitimate transfer is not a problem and should be handled differently from the migrant transfer. Legitimate transfers are principally students who change from one institution to another for a definite purpose, such as graduates of junior colleges, students transferring to graduate schools, medical schools, law schools, and other professional schools. For this class of transfers, standards of evaluation should be low enough to insure the acceptance of students capable of continuing their work and high enough to limit the enrolment of the institutions to which they transfer to the maximum desired by such institutions. It is evident that such standards must be different for practically all institutions, and the standards must differ as the institutions differ. It does not seem necessary or advisable to discuss this type of transfer at greater length.

Unfortunately, the migrant type of transfer student presents a more serious problem. Practically all colleges and universities have been faced with the problem of students entering one institution, remaining for one or two terms, transferring to another institution for a short period, and then going on from there. This process will often continue until the student decides to give up his educational career, or gets to the point at which no reputable institution will admit him. Of course, there are cases in which it is necessary for a student to transfer from one institution to another because of finances, health, the moving of families, a desire for a more diversified education, or for some similar reason. However, for the most part, migrants transfer because they are dissatisfied, or are having difficulty with their work and are looking for an institution which they can attend without much effort on their part. Some are advised by college or university officials to resign, and immediately begin looking for another institution to enter. Others are never satisfied with what they are doing and think they will be better satisfied

elsewhere. As a general rule, this type of student will not be satisfied or successful at any institution of higher learning and, by transferring, constitutes a problem to the institution to which he transfers.

It is evident that institutions must set their standards of admission and standards of evaluation of transfer credits high enough to eliminate this type of student, and, at the same time, low enough so that it will not unduly penalize the student wishing to transfer for some legitimate reason. Once the number of students transferring was so small that each case could be handled individually by the dean, department head, or some such official. With the increase in the number of transfer students, it has become necessary to set definite standards in the evaluation of credits and to centralize this work in one place. For the most part, the work has been assumed by the registrar or admissions officer. It is his duty to obtain an official transcript of the student's record from each institution the student has attended. He then checks the transcript to determine whether or not the student is entitled to admission on the basis of his past record. Next comes the task of actually evaluating the work. This task may be done in a number of ways and no set formula can be prescribed for all institutions; for this reason, it does not seem advisable to discuss the mechanics of the actual evaluation. After the standards have been determined, it is comparatively easy to routinize the evaluation.

However, sagacious admission practices toward transfer students can not be secured by merely routinizing evaluation methods. At least two additional lines of departure should be considered: (1) adequate information should be at hand regarding the standards of the institutions previously attended, supplemented by careful studies of the success or failure of other transfers from the same institutions; (2) as much information as possible should be obtained about the individual student himself and his reasons for transferring. Results on standard tests are helpful. A personal interview may prove desirable. Matters of health, home life and financial status frequently play an important role. The whole procedure can best be summed by saying, "It is easy to make a proper decision when you have *all* the facts."

In most institutions of higher learning, the admissions officer is the first official to come in contact with the prospective transfer student. It is the duty of this officer to handle these transfer students in accordance with standards set by his institution. For this reason, he is quite familiar with the difficulties arising from the

transfer of students, and is, therefore, in a better position than other officials to advise in setting the standards of evaluation of transfer credits for his institution. There seems to have been a tendency on the part of institutions of higher learning to discourage transfer students by reducing the amount of transfer credit allowed. In some cases this proved satisfactory, but in the case of the undesirable transfer it is doubtful if this method had much effect. Although this method might cause the student to sacrifice a large amount of credit, it offered no insurance against his transferring. For instance, some institutions do not accept courses in which the lowest passing grade is recorded. This policy penalizes all transfer students regardless of their reasons for transferring. The legitimate transfer student with an average record from an accredited institution of higher learning may be unduly penalized, while the migrant transfer, not caring about graduation, will in fact be admitted without penalty. For this reason, institutions might better accomplish their purpose by raising their standards for admission of transfer students and lowering their standards of evaluation of transfer credits. The standards for admission and the standards of evaluation are closely related, and in setting one of them, the other should always be kept in mind.

The admissions officer, in evaluating transcripts, should pay careful attention to all notations on the transcripts, and in so far as possible carry out any penalties imposed by the institution which the student has attended. For example, an institution may suspend a student for a definite period because of his scholastic standing. This is done, at least theoretically, for the best interest of the student. Under such circumstances, if he is admitted to another institution during this period, the penalty imposed by the original institution is entirely eliminated. Each admissions officer should recognize and abide by any decisions or recommendations made by the officials of the other institution. On the other hand, it is the responsibility of the institution from which the student is transferring to give complete and accurate information on the record of the student. Only in this way may an institution prescribe and enforce definite standards of evaluation of transfer credits.

In closing, I wish to make it clear that I do not favor a hard and fast set of rules to be applied to all cases alike. The personal element in individual cases is often so great that the application of an iron-clad set of standards defeats the very purpose for which they were established.

BULLETIN OF THE
STANDARDS OF GRADING

ANNIE C. WHITESIDE

When this topic was assigned to me I realized its difficulty, but was glad of an opportunity to read what has been written and to organize my own thoughts on the subject. I have little hope that this group of registrars will be able to offer a satisfactory solution of a problem on which there are such varied opinions.

In the early days of higher education, records were of secondary importance. Enrolments were small and the relation between faculty and students, or even between president and students, was so close that much of the student's record was carried in the minds of faculty and president. Grades were reported to the student by the instructor and entered upon the books at his convenience and in his own handwriting. I suspect that even in those days there were some professors who were a law unto themselves—that some gave sessional standings of 99 and that others were proud of the many failures in their classes. The first registrars were mere bookkeepers and it would have been heresy for one of them even to make a suggestion in regard to grade distribution. It was only because the professors did not quite trust their fellow professors that they decided to leave standardization of grades to the registrar. The resulting condition is both the reason for our being and the bane of it.

Now, in national convention, we are seeking to standardize ourselves. The question is, How far shall standardization go?

There are almost as many systems of grading as there are colleges. A few examples are: (1) the numerical; (2) S and U, or pass and fail; (3) excellent, good, etc.; (4) letters of the alphabet in varied combinations and with varied significance; (5) rank in class. Surely we might agree upon whether there shall be one, two, or four passing grades, etc.

There is no agreement as to the purpose of grades. It is generally admitted that grades are necessary for administrative purposes, but there is the further claim that they are for the purpose of stimulating the pupil to study and of serving the teacher as an instrument of reward or punishment.

A further question is, *What does the teacher grade?* Would it not be an advantage if we could agree upon the purpose of grades and upon just what is being graded? I am sure that all of us would like to have some standard so that when we look at a transcript we would have some idea of its meaning.

I should say that progress in recent years has been away from any such agreement rather than toward it. There have been arguments against the literal grades on the grounds, (1) that they are unscientific, (2) that they stand as a barrier between teacher and student, (3) that they promote superficial scholarship and poor teaching, and (4) that they do not represent the students' scholastic ability since A's are given for *amiability* and D's for *disciplinary purposes*. All sins are charged to the particular system in use at the time. Would not these same arguments hold for any one of the suggested substitute methods? The teacher who is influenced by personality in assigning A, B, C, etc., would also be influenced by personality in determining the student's relative standing, or in determining whether the student should have an "S" or a "U." I, for one, am not at all sure that we make such a mistake in letting personality enter into the question. If a grade is to be any indication of the student's ability to get along, amiability certainly helps.

Some feel that our examinations are all wrong, that the standardized objective tests would give a better indication of the student's real ability. Again, I am skeptical. I feel that most of these tests give but a vague indication as to whether or not the student has his facts in useable form.

If we can ever agree upon the purpose of grades and a system of grading, can we go further and have grades mean the same in all institutions? I am afraid not. Whether the grade represents some absolute achievement or merely the relative standing of a student, it will vary in different institutions. The objective tests would be a help in comparing the students of one institution with those of another. We shall do well if we can make a certain grade always mean the same in a given institution, or even in a given department of an institution. Certainly this standardization within the institution is something for which we should strive. Many methods have been suggested. Of these, it appears that some sort of application of a normal curve of distribution is perhaps the best. This cannot be rigidly enforced. The whole theory of the normal curve rests on the fact that a certain per cent, say the middle 50 per cent, come within narrow limits and is always located in the middle. May not some colleges draw a majority of students who should be grouped where the upper 10 per cent is grouped in another college? There are varied suggestions as to the shape of this curve. Perhaps each college will have to decide upon its own, as the Columbia Law School has done; that is, by studying records over a period of years

and comparing these with the results of standard tests. I am not at all sure the system would work, but a suggested curve might help. Each instructor could be informed as to how he stands with reference to the faculty average in assigning the various grades. Knowing that he gives to a freshmen section three times as many A's as does his neighboring professor might have a wholesome effect on Mr. A. If we can agree upon the purpose of grades, and the number of passing grades to be used, we shall have made some progress. A further step would be for each institution to offer suggestions as to the proper grade distribution for its own students.

It is a comforting thought that we registrars are the custodians of standards in grading, if indeed we *are*. The danger lies in what we grade. Is our stock in trade teachers' marks—a somewhat perishable product? What the student leaves on our books may represent only a small fraction of his personality. I insist that we should in our thinking reach deeper into student aims and purposes. Our records or future transcripts should not narrow educational aims, and this is the only result possible if our sole function is to record grades.

I believe in great teachers, first; and in grading, second. Does grading and insistence upon a certain form destroy individuality in the teacher? Is not the registrar for academic freedom of a certain kind? Is the registrar's office merely a clearing house, or an influence on college standards?

SUMMARY

ALICE L. BUTLER

Mr. Southwick, Registrar of the College of Wooster, opened the meeting with a paper on "Standards in the Admission of Freshmen." He dealt in part of his paper with the problem that is before all colleges at the present time, that of the recruiting of students and the unethical means that are employed in many places. The discussion that followed the paper emphasized the growing desire for a complete personnel record on every student admitted.

Mr. Chandler, of the University of Florida, presented the second paper, "Standards in the Evaluation of Transferred Credits." In the paper and the discussion following it, the need for each college to have its own standards and its own procedures was stressed, but it

was felt very strongly that each college should establish standards for itself and then should follow them.

Miss Annie Whiteside, Registrar of Randolph-Macon Woman's College, had the topic "Standards in Grading." It is evident from the discussion following this paper that, in the institutions where the registrar has made a study of faculty grades for the entire institution, there was a tendency for grades to conform more nearly to the standards which the institution desired for its grading system. In some cases, good results were obtained by publishing a report for the faculty. In others, knowledge that it was made and could be consulted in the registrar's office was sufficient. Dr. Bernreuter, of Pennsylvania State College, who was attending the session, was interested in this discussion from the standpoint of the instructor. He felt that the faculty member really needs all the information he can get from the registrar, and it would be a kindness to the faculty members if reports were given them, showing how their marks compared with marks given by others.

The last discussion of the afternoon was by Mr. Smyser, of Miami University. He discussed the question, "Standards in the Administration of Regulations." He described his own experience in codifying the rules in the institution with which he is connected, and suggested that if such a code did not exist in other institutions it would be found very valuable. He urged that there should not be over-fussiness in obeying the letter of rules, but that we should use judgment and give careful, intelligent, conscientious enforcement of rules at our institutions.

Symposium

The Registrar and His Relations with the Outside World

W. S. HOFFMAN, CHAIRMAN

THE REGISTRAR AS A CONSTRUCTIVE CITIZEN

ALMA H. PREINKERT

Almost every commencement address to which I have listened has included a plea to the graduates, that as they go out into the world, they fulfill their duties and responsibilities as good citizens. I do not know how effective such admonitions are in making lasting impressions, which will be projected into action, but in listening to them I have often wondered if sufficient emphasis is placed on training for citizenship in the high school and college curriculums. I have also wondered if the older men and women of the college community are setting high standards in their civic and political activities, thus serving as good examples for impressionable students. Precepts and examples are far more effective than all the admonitions and advice we can give.

How well is the registrar, who should be a leader in the college community, fulfilling his obligations as an American citizen? Some of us feel that there is no time to devote to affairs outside the office, and anyone who reads Mr. Quick's analysis of our duties will agree that registrars are very busy people. But no matter how many other duties we may have, somehow we must find time for those responsibilities which are ours by virtue of the fact that we are American citizens. We accept the benefits of our government; it is only fair that we should carry our share of the common burden.

From the days of the American and French revolutions, the democratic principle, that the people themselves should have a voice in their own government, has stood in high repute, and dictatorships have been deplored, because they relegated power into the hands of a few. Since the World War a great change has taken place, and democratic forms of government throughout the world have faced difficult days. American democracy is no exception. It is confronted on every hand with economic, social, and political problems. Facts and figures are not needed to prove such a statement. Evidences of it lie all around us. And at the head of the long

list of serious problems which must find solutions, none is more important and urgent than that involving the widespread indifference of educated men and women to their duties and responsibilities as citizens. Large numbers are merely passive onlookers in the great national drama. The government does things for them and to them, but they do not feel themselves to be in any vital way the government. This is a dangerous state of affairs, and if democracy is to be preserved in this country, control must not be allowed to fall into the hands of a few. Too many of us think of politics as the activity of a corrupt ward politician. In its real sense, it is something that vitally affects the lives of everyone of us, directly and indirectly, in scores of ways, and there is no possible escape from its influences. Taxation, highways and streets, schools, fire, health and police protection, water and sanitation, courts and customs houses, jails and asylums, the post office, and the laws and ordinances under which we live all fall under its control. These spring from government, which in turn goes back to parties, and parties *are* politics. To make American government a successful enterprise, the foremost duty of each one of us is to vote at every election. Those seeking public office must be carefully investigated before election, and after election, carefully watched to see that public interest rather than private gain is the controlling motive. The voting citizen has in his vote the most effective means for the accomplishment of reforms. In every community the weakness of government, and the power and evil of political machines are exactly equal to the inertia, indifference, and inactivity of the intelligent people of that community.

To strive for an understanding of the great national questions is another obligation that rests on the intelligent citizen. These problems affect the welfare of every individual in all parts of the country and also determine our relations as a nation with the rest of the world. In the last analysis, the citizens are responsible for the policies of their government which have been adopted by their duly elected representatives. The intelligent citizen must be ready to support and advocate new policies, or modifications of old ones. We cannot find the best solutions of our problems by muddling through. We can save the nobler qualities of our democratic society only by intelligent direction and by keeping social-minded and humanitarian points of view in the foreground.

It is true that no one person, or even one group, can expect to bring about a solution of complicated national problems. However,

the opinions of the leaders in the community are respected and carry considerable weight. If they will express humanitarian, social-minded, and liberal opinions on national and civic problems, much can be done towards the formulation of a wise public opinion. Out of the clash of conflicting opinions, popular decisions are crystallized. And changes in the political, social, and economic order result, or proposed changes are deliberately repudiated. If intelligent and unselfish citizens will co-operate in combating the influence of graft, gangsterism, and the general break-down of organized society, they can build up a body of public opinion that will go far in bringing about wholesome changes. The greater popular interest that can be aroused in problems of government, the more effectively can the people achieve their aspirations. It is right here that registrars can wield considerable influence in molding public opinion among students.

In most cases, the home community furnishes the field for most useful activity on the part of a citizen. Movements to make it a more prosperous, healthful, enjoyable, and uplifting place in which to live afford wide opportunities for constructive citizenship. There are many latent forces in every community that need only definite aim, effective organization and skillful leadership to accomplish much in raising the level of community life. Few people are better qualified to contribute to civic improvement than is the registrar whose training has taught him how to co-operate with others in planning, organizing, and directing work efficiently. His assistance in the formulation of educational policies should prove of real value. And most communities could benefit considerably by his advice on matters pertaining to the keeping of records.

In connection with community activity, there is an interesting story about Edward Bok who performed an unusual service for his community. A great lover of flowers, he wanted Americans to share the joy and beauty he found in them. At his home in Merion, Pennsylvania, he planted myriads of spring flowers and dogwood trees where his neighbours could enjoy them—and flowering fruit trees and roses near the railroad station. As a result a real interest in flowers was aroused, not only in his own town but also in other communities, for people who saw the beautiful displays were awakened to a new civic consciousness. In commenting on his gardens, he said that he had, in a sense, carried out his grandmother's injunction: "Make you the world a bit better or more beautiful because

you have lived in it." If all could perform their civic duties in such a spirit, what delightful places the home communities might become.

The registrar can make an important contribution to good citizenship by working for the inclusion of effective courses of training for citizenship in all curriculums in his institution. Although most colleges have special instructors for athletics, music, art, dramatics, and other subjects that are of general interest, there are few with special departments in citizenship. Many college catalogues include courses that contribute to good citizenship, but in most of them there is no definite statement of such an aim. The field of adult education offers a splendid opportunity for this type of work. The founders of our country considered training for citizenship, government, and politics the prime aim and chief justification of the school system, and the history of the colonial college shows a remarkable community interest and a close relationship between life on the college campus and life outside its walls. Today, we hear complaints on every hand, that something is radically wrong with the schools because they do not train for citizenship. We, who are directly concerned with education, must have the vision to see that the strength of American Government lies in the education of its citizens and that the schools provide the surest and speediest means of revitalizing American democracy. With an intelligent citizenry, having a high conception of public duty, we shall not need to fear the outcome of this chaotic era.

In his many contacts, the registrar will find countless opportunities for service to his community, the state, and the nation. A great responsibility rests upon him to set an example in civic usefulness and to make his influence felt in government to the end that the motivating force shall be humanitarian progress rather than selfish interest. In the willingness of its solid-thinking citizens to attend to the grave problems confronting the country, lies democracy's greatest safeguard.

THE RELATIONS OF THE REGISTRAR WITH PARENTS OF FUTURE, PRESENT, AND PAST STUDENTS

H. H. ARMSBY

I believe that the main purpose of this presentation is to provoke discussion, and that a description of my own imperfect procedures will serve this purpose as well as, or perhaps better than, a descrip-

tion of the perfect procedures, if there be any such. I am therefore planning to discuss very briefly my methods of dealing with parents of future, present, and past students, with no apologies for the use of the little word "I."

As Registrar I am usually the first person connected with my college with whom prospective students and their parents come in contact. The first contact is made in many different ways. I speak at a large number of high schools each year and meet a great many prospective students, and the parents of some of them. Many parents bring their boys to visit the college, and many more make their first contact by letter. No matter how the contact is made, I have much to do with prospective students and their parents, and on my treatment of these people depends to a considerable extent the future enrolment of my college, with all that is implied thereby.

When Mr. and Mrs. Smith plan to send Johnny to college, they are considering a large investment of time and money, and they need all the advice and information they can get, particularly if they themselves are not college graduates. They need, and are entitled to receive, courteous, friendly, interested, *correct* information—not propaganda or ballyhoo.

An educational institution can serve its students best if the students are properly qualified to do the type of work offered by the institution, and are interested in its objectives. This is particularly true in a specialized institution such as the one I represent. We are a college of science and engineering. Our objective is to train boys (girls too, if they are interested) for engineering and scientific work; and boys who are not interested in that sort of work, or who are not properly qualified to do it, should not be encouraged to enrol. I never have tried, and I hope I never shall try, to *persuade* any boy to attend our institution. Instead, I make an earnest attempt to give each boy the best advice I can, and to tell him the truth as I see it about the college, the profession for which it prepares, and his own chances for success in each—and then let him and his parents decide for themselves whether or not they want what we have to offer. To do otherwise would eventually, I believe, create enemies for the institution instead of friends. Like most small colleges, we want students, but we want students who are qualified to do our work and who are interested in doing it—and above all, we want the good will of the citizens of our state. My whole effort, therefore, in dealing with Johnny and his parents is *not* to paint a *rosy* picture of the college or of the profession, but to give them a *true* picture.

Parents of prospective students ask two sorts of questions; those referring to engineering education and the engineering profession in general; and those referring to our college in particular. In the first group they ask such questions as "What is engineering?" "What are the opportunities for graduates?" "Can *Johnny* become an engineer?" These are hard questions to answer, but I do the best I can. I tell them briefly what the various kinds of engineers do, about our employment record through the depression, and about the future of engineering as I see it. I discuss Johnny's high school record and its indications; his likes and dislikes; jobs he has held and how he liked them; his hobbies; his plans for the future. I outline our testing program and explain its indications. In all this discussion I try to avoid unnecessary discouragement or unwarranted encouragement, and if the indications are that Johnny is not qualified to do our work I have no hesitation in saying so. Of course, making them believe me may be another matter. I am reminded of a letter I once received. Johnny had been advised not to enrol. However, he did enrol. He flunked out. He was allowed to cancel his record and start again. He flunked out again, and was then told that he could not return. His mother wrote, "I was at first inclined to be angry with you and your faculty, but after thinking it over I feel only pity for a group of men who consider themselves intelligent but who are unable to appreciate true genius when they meet it. Thank God there are other engineering schools." To which my mental (but *not* written) reply was, "Amen."

The second class of questions, specific ones relating to our own college, are many and varied, as we all know. Johnny's parents want to know our admission requirements and procedures. They are vitally interested in expenses, including fees, books, special equipment and clothing, living expenses—board and room, general and social expenses. They ask about financial aid to students—scholarships, loan funds, jobs in college or town. They are anxious about the health service of the college, approved rooming houses (we have no dormitories), our hospital service, and visits with the family either at college or at home. (I try to encourage these, to prevent homesickness, which is often a serious malady for a freshman.) They are much concerned about the general living conditions Johnny will face if he enrolls; about hazing, and drinking; about his social life; and the moral tone of the college and of the town; about the amount and kind of college supervision over students. Many of them discuss fraternities—their cost and desirability. In answering

this class of questions I try to tell them the *truth*—not to give them sugar pills. If jobs are scarce, as they usually are, I say so. "Is there any drinking among the students?" Of course there is, and Johnny will have to learn to govern himself in this respect, just as he would have to do in any other college. In short, I try to give his parents a *correct* picture of what Johnny may expect if he enrolls.

We might assume that after Johnny enters college he will tell his parents everything they should know about his progress, but the fact is that often he does not. College authorities, whether they like it or not, must of necessity, to some extent, stand *in loco parentis* (or is it simply *loco*?). They cannot disclaim all responsibility for Johnny by saying, "He is now a man and must look out for himself"; because, after all, Johnny is still just about the same boy he was three months ago when he graduated from high school, and he still needs someone to look after him, to some extent. Of course, this matter of supervision can easily be overdone, and one of the most important things Johnny should learn in college is to stand on his own feet, look out for himself, and take the responsibility for his own acts, but he cannot be expected to learn all this simply by going through the process of registration. Johnny's parents are entitled to courteous, friendly, interested service from the college authorities. They should be advised of matters which directly affect Johnny, and should be kept in touch with his progress through college—or out of it. Here too, what is needed is not sugar pills, but the *truth*. After registration, contacts with Johnny's parents are usually made mainly by letters and formal reports, but visits to the college are encouraged, and I sometimes manage to call on parents while visiting high schools.

Information given to parents of students falls into two general classifications. The first is the sort of information conveyed in formal reports which are sent to all parents whether asked for or not, and which cover grades, absences, discipline, and honors. We report failures at the end of the first month to parents of freshmen; and make complete grade reports at the middle and end of each semester to parents of all students. Parents are notified when students are dropped from school or placed on scholastic probation. The number of absences for the semester is reported with the final grades. Special reports are made in individual cases if it seems advisable. All disciplinary actions are reported to parents, as are honors won.

The second class of information given to parents consists of answers to specific questions from them, and in nearly every case requires an interview with Johnny, and often with one or more of his teachers, followed by a personal letter or verbal report to his parents. They ask almost anything one can think of in connection with a college student, and they expect, and should receive, a courteous, interested, and *true* reply, in so far as is possible. Such questions are asked as—How is Johnny getting along? Why did he fail that course? How can he make it up? Does he need a tutor? Should he go to summer school? Should he change his course? When can he graduate?

And eventually, of course, John does graduate (if he does not "quituate" instead), and becomes an alumnus or a former student. Probably most thoughtful people are in agreement in believing that the college has not completed its full measure of service to John when it gives him a diploma or a letter of dismissal. After all, a college education is not so much an end in itself as it is a means to a larger end. College is supposed to help John to find himself and his niche in society; to prepare him to be a better citizen—more useful to society than he would be without its influence, and incidentally more valuable to himself. It seems to me that the college should have an interest in helping John to find his place in society, so that he may have an opportunity to use the training the college has given him, for his own advancement and for the good of society. If it fails to do this, and to keep in touch with him, it seems to me the college has not done its full duty by John.

In the case of a college giving such specialized training as does the one I represent, this obligation is particularly binding. We prepare John to take a place in the ranks of one of the professions most important to society—we should help him to enter it and to progress in it. We do this through our employment service, which is conducted by our Assistant Registrar and which has been remarkably successful in finding positions for our graduates, even through these last few depression years. We try to keep in touch with our alumni and former students—to find jobs for them—to get the latter to return to college and finish their courses. We believe that our alumni are our best advertisements and advertising agents, and our best "field men."

All these activities are of course carried on for the most part directly with John, but we often have occasion for dealing with Mr. and Mrs. Smith also. However, our contacts with parents of past

students are quite limited, and we would welcome suggestions on how to increase them. John is of course older now and is quite definitely "on his own." He needs Dad and Mother less than he used to—so do we. But we try not to lose all touch with them, and many of our best friends, both officially and personally, are to be found among the parents with whom we have co-operated during their son's progress from the status of Johnny, a future student, to that of John, a past student.

THE RELATION OF THE REGISTRAR TO PROGRESSIVE MOVEMENTS IN THE FIELD OF EDUCATION

M. E. GLADFELTER

May I, at the outset, direct your attention to the statement of my topic, "The Relation of the Registrar to Progressive Movements in the Field of Education." Do not confuse this with what could properly be the subject for another discussion, namely, "The Relation of the Registrar to Movements in the Field of Progressive Education." Even though I shall give some attention to the latter topic, I wish to take cognizance of the difference between the two statements—"progressive movements in the field of education" and "movements in the field of Progressive Education." The word progressive when written with a small letter "p" has a quite different meaning from the progressive with a capital "P." Many who are in the traditional school consider themselves progressive while those in the Progressive school disclaim any kinship to them.

For most of this discussion I shall consider movements progressive when they meet the qualification set forth by Webster rather than by Dewey. Webster defines "progressive" as forward moving. Registrars are concerned primarily about those happenings in the whole broad field of education which seem to suggest that some few persons or institutions here and there have tapped a new well in this educational process. These wells seem temporarily to gush forth with a rich oil which has the base common to all oils, but which has new components—components which promise improvement in the refining process. To most of us such findings have a profound significance.

For some it is difficult to depart from the conventional. They consider the proponents of the progressive movements a minority group who need not be reckoned with, and their programs mere ripples which will vanish with the next economic or industrial tide.

They regard these minority leaders as an old County Superintendent of Schools in the Dutch district of Pennsylvania regarded his opponents at election time. He had been superintendent for many years. A few men usually opposed him but he always won. In one campaign, when his opponents were somewhat formidable, one of his friends remarked to him, "Well, I see you have some opposition in the election this time." In characteristic Pennsylvania Dutch manner he replied, "Dere iss candidates, but no opposition."

I remember a discussion which took place in a small group a few years ago when I was attending my first registrars' convention. The discussion centered about a revolutionary change which recently had been instituted in the curricular organization of a large American university. One of the men intimated that the plan had not been working too successfully. Immediately that "I told you so" look came upon the face of another. Interestingly enough, that plan has gone forward and is the forerunner of a score of reorganizations in American higher education. Yes—it is difficult to depart from the traditional path.

The relationship about which I want to speak is not a physical relationship, but rather a mental receptiveness. The dissertations which for many years have been delivered before this association on topics which deal with the importance of the position of the registrar speak of the responsibility which rests upon him. Because of the importance of his position in the administrative set-up, what should be his relation to progressive movements in education?

First, he should have a non-mechanical philosophy of education. In 1923 when President McVey of Kentucky opened the first Institute for Registrars at the University of Kentucky, he said:

The office of keeper of the rolls is an ancient and an honorable one. It figures in most historic romances somewhere between the beginning and the end and occasionally attracts the attention of the historian in his search for materials. Every kingdom had such an officer for the reason that rulers found it convenient to know what had been done by their predecessors. The office, however, was little more than a repository for records and the holder grew fat and lazy while he contemplated his fees with satisfaction.

In the address he was lamenting the plight of those registrars who

still sat, and who sat somewhat still, in a small uninviting room fondling a few shoe boxes full of records which were kept on the window sill.

In 1934 when addressing this association in Cincinnati, President McVey said:

The registrar stands as a kind of outguard between secondary education and higher education. He has had a very extensive development in the last fifteen years, while he has moved from a bookkeeper and a secreter of records and grades to an officer who is really interested in educational procedure and who has more material in his possession for study of educational procedure than any other group or any other agency in the field of education.

During the eleven years which separated these two statements, the educational complexion of the registrar became hale and hearty. He passed from the Office of Lord High Keeper of the Privy Seal to that of Chief Interpreter of Educational Trends. The continued growth of his office will depend, however, upon his ability to relate himself properly to those movements in the whole broad field of education which each day continue to revolutionize the manner and method of his duties. He must be non-mechanical.

Everyone who thinks has a point of view toward life. The teacher, the student, the merchant, the postman, and the garage mechanic all see the world from a unique point of view conditioned by occupational limitations. The registrar has his point of view. Because of the phrases which become his helpmates he is apt to become enchanted by credits, grades, semester hours, and required courses and close his eyes to that which is of real importance. Unless he becomes non-mechanical in his thinking, he will remain in the side show and fail to see what is happening under the main tent.

As I read the list of topics which are to be discussed at the open forum, I am impressed by the tenor of many of them. Much of the forward movement in the adoption of new methods for evaluating the ability of applicants to do college work can be attributed to registrars. They have given the impetus to this shift in emphasis. The fact that admission officers in some of our leading institutions are expressing a greater interest in qualitative requirements than in quantitative requirements is of considerable significance.

The decreasing importance of the Carnegie unit and the increasing use of achievement and aptitude tests in admission to college reflects a wholesome relationship between registrars and progressive movements. When you read the *Bulletin* of this association you cannot

help but be impressed by the productivity of research among registrars in fields related to this new emphasis in admissions. I frequently wonder if we are fully aware of the tremendous influence which this work might exert upon the whole problem of measurement and outcomes in higher education.

There still are some in collegiate circles who, when admitting students, prefer Cicero or Vergil five forty-minute periods each week, for forty weeks with the certifying grade of eighty per cent to a high score on an aptitude, psychological, or achievement test. The registrar should, however, place on the balance the abundant evidence which is available and which makes new admission plans no longer a postulate.

In the second place, to relate himself properly to progressive movements in the field of education, the registrar should have a constant consciousness of objectives. Because of the nature of his work, a keeper of records is often apt to become more meticulous about rules and regulations, credits, and semester hours, than he is concerned about objectives and outcomes. He becomes like the Chinese who, when he first saw a window pane, was so fascinated by the glass that he failed to see the beautiful valley which it opened to his view.

One of the surprising things about college catalogs is the absence of statements of institutional objectives. The nearest approach is a series of such statements as: "One hundred and twenty-eight semester hours are required for the degree," "Upon the completion of this course the student has sufficient credits to qualify for the teacher's certificate in this state or commonwealth." Necessary as are the above statements, one cannot help but feel that an institution has direction when it sets forth functional objectives. President Robertson, of Goucher College, in his recent address before the twenty-second meeting of the Association of American Colleges exemplified the kind of objectives which are functional. These are the objectives:

1. The first is the establishment and maintenance of physical and mental health.
2. The comprehension and communication of ideas in the mother tongue and one foreign language.
3. The understanding of the scientific method in theory and application.

4. The understanding of the heritage of the past in its relation to the present.
5. Establishment of satisfying relations with individuals and with groups; the art of human relations—an art furthered by residence.
6. The utilization of resources with economic and esthetic satisfaction. We include the use of time, money, and strength, and not only economic satisfactions but also esthetic satisfactions resulting therefrom.
7. The enjoyment of literature and the other fine arts.
8. Philosophical and religious values.

In accepting such objectives one recognizes courses and curricula as economic and administrative conveniences in arriving at a desired end. The article by Mr. Limbert on the New College at Columbia, published in the last issue of the *Bulletin*¹ of this association, also gives expression to an enlarged concept of the scope of the college curriculum. Permit me to quote again, this time the problems set forth by New College:

1. Adjusting to and co-operating with others
2. Maintaining physical and mental health
3. Achieving economic and political security
4. Adjusting to and controlling the natural environment
5. Interpreting and creating art and beauty
6. Searching for guiding principles and ultimate values
7. Acquiring and transmitting the social heritage

Probably most of my time should have been devoted to two progressive movements which might eventually reconstruct the whole technique in the measurement of the progress of an individual student: first, the work of the Educational Records Bureau, and second, the eight-year experimental study of the Progressive Education Association.

The testing service and the cumulative records offered by the Educational Records Bureau represent a technique which is receiving wide-spread acclaim. Those of us who have had an opportunity to examine applications from secondary school students who participated in the Pennsylvania Study are acquainted with the techniques which were employed.

¹ Vol. XI, No. 3 (April, 1936).

There can be little doubt of the value of such records in the evaluation of the abilities of individual students. For guidance and counseling, cumulative records offer information which unfortunately is not found on the forms which are now commonly used.

Collegiate registrars can do much to encourage the use of these instruments. They can, by careful and painstaking study, not only promote their use in, and adaptation to higher education but also encourage their adoption in secondary education.

The second movement, the study being conducted by the Progressive Education Association, is still in its formative stages, that is, colleges have not yet had the opportunity to evaluate the success of the experiment in terms of its product.

This plan provides that a small group of secondary schools be set free by the colleges to engage in experimental study of the work of the secondary school, and the colleges agree to accept students from these schools for a period of five years, beginning in 1936, without regard to the course and unit requirements now generally in force for all students and without further examination.

The objectives are not as clearly defined as are those for some other experiments, but the purposes are sound. Upon the registrar, as the outpost between secondary and higher education, rests the responsibility of being a participant in this experiment if it is to succeed.

Finally, to relate himself properly to progressive movements in the field of education, the registrar must be concerned with articulation.

It is difficult for any of us to determine which movements represent trends and which are merely ripples on the surface. How common must a practice be before it becomes a trend?

Someone tells the story of a young man in Harlem who desired to join a lodge and had a friend propose him for membership. After several weeks he asked this friend whether he had been elected, and the friend rather grimly said, "No." The Negro said to his proposer, "You don't mean that somebody gave me a black-ball, do you?" The proposer said, "Rastus, did you ever see Russian caviar?" One black-ball may represent a trend. Certainly we need not wait until our spot diagram looks like caviar.

The inception of anticipatory examinations should make every registrar responsive to the problem of articulation. These examinations may do much to reconstruct our philosophy of higher education. I heard recently of a college president who requested the dean

to insert a statement in the catalog to the effect that no student could be graduated until he had paid tuition for at least eight semesters. Anticipatory examinations will have little place in that institution. Speaking on articulation, Dean Root of Princeton said at the last meeting of the Middle States Association that more than half of the six hundred twenty-five freshmen admitted to Princeton last September are carrying one or more sophomore subjects. One freshman is carrying five sophomore subjects.

The splendid work which is being carried on at Buffalo should demand much attention. Many institutions are pioneering along this same line—Goucher, Chicago, Illinois, and others, but I mention Princeton and Buffalo because of the intensive effort which is directing the experiments there.

The registrar, because of the position he occupies in the university organization, must take cognizance of these movements, study their procedures, and evaluate their effectiveness.

In conclusion, may I repeat a sentence with which I began—the relation with which I am concerned is not a physical relationship but rather a mental receptiveness. I have set forth three attitudes which the registrar should assume if he is to relate himself properly to progressive movements in the field of education: (1) he should have a non-mechanical philosophy of education; (2) he should have a constant consciousness of objectives; (3) he should be concerned with the problem of articulation.

With an abundance of research and progressiveness about us, let it not be necessary for us when we measure our progress to repeat the words of William Dean Howells:

It still seems to me lamentable that I should have had to grope my way and so imperfectly find it where a little light from another's lamp would have instantly shown it.

THE EDUCATIONAL FUNCTION OF THE REGISTRAR

MARY BELDEN JAMES LEHN

My quarter of a century of experience in the work of this honorable profession seems to have brought me at last to that state of philosophic calm or despair, or something, where practically nothing can astonish me. And yet I confess that I am always conscious of a distinct sense of astonishment when I hear anyone express a doubt that the primary function of the registrar is an educational one. Now

I feel sure that I am not the only registrar who hears such doubts expressed and is astonished by them, and probably I am not the only one who feels convinced that instead of being merely astonished by them we ought to make a determined effort to show the doubters that their doubts are grounded in nothing more stable than simple ignorance. They simply do not know what registrars do.

Very few people really know what registrars do. The outside world does not know—how could it, unless and until it gets some first hand inside information? And generally the rest of the educational world does not know. Its members are too much occupied with executing their own functions—with their teaching and research, their testing and guidance programs, their planning and publicity—to spend time in observing and evaluating the functions and procedures of the registrar. And many times I fear we registrars ourselves do not know. We are far too busy exercising our functions to pause and analyze them, to classify and name them, to consider whether or not they are educational.

But when the question is directly asked, as it was asked of me not long ago, "Is the registrar's function primarily educational?" I think the only convincing reply must be: "I shall tell you the things the registrars do. Decide for yourself whether or not they are educational."

Now I have not prepared myself for this occasion by sending out to my colleagues in the profession any elaborate questionnaires asking you just what you do and how you do it, nor have I undertaken any deep study of the finer shades of meaning carried by the term "educational function." I have not had time. I have been too busy discharging my function of working for the good of my college, and never once doubting the educational value of what I was doing. So I come before you today with no special preparation other than that of my twenty-five years' experience in the field, to lay before you a few facts which I know of my own knowledge, and to offer you some conclusions which I firmly believe to be true.

The duties of registrars in colleges and universities are highly diversified. In some, they are many and complex; in others, relatively few and simple. It would be hard indeed, I think, to find two registrars in any two different colleges in the country whose duties were exactly the same. And yet, every single one of us contributes in a marked degree to the advancement of the education of the students his work concerns—and if that be not the final test of an educational

function, then there is no final test, and the term itself is meaningless jargon.

The office of registrar came into being, as we all know, to meet a need for some careful, intelligent, centralized recording of the names and past history of the students entering a college, and of their current academic history throughout the period of their attendance. This function of recording angel has always been and still is common to all registrars. But for most of us, the recording function is now a very small part of our actual work. With the growth and expansion of institutions of higher learning, and with the development of complex methods of organization and systems of administration, this seemingly simple function has become involved and interwoven with many other matters like requirements for admission, curriculum requirements, program arrangements, granting of degrees, honors, prizes, and the like; and the registrar, because of his function of keeper of each student's history, has been charged with many additional duties related to those matters.

When I say that he is charged with these additional duties *because of his function of keeper of each student's record*, I mean just this: the good registrar—and of course I am talking of him alone, for the bad registrar no more discharges an educational function than does the bad teacher—the good registrar not only records accurately and completely the history of each student, but also knows and understands each history; he considers and evaluates it with intelligence and sympathy. Having done this, he knows as much as one can know about each student's academic life considered as a complete unit, and is in an excellent position to consider requirements for admission, curriculum requirements, etc., from the point of view of their bearing on every student's academic life. Because of this special knowledge, the registrar can be, and many times is directly involved in the establishment of policies governing entrance requirements and curriculum requirements and undertakes the application of these requirements to individual cases.

Applying these requirements to individual cases means that he advises prospective applicants, determines the eligibility of applicants, places them in a curriculum, guides their elections, and arranges and modifies their programs of study from term to term. In like manner, his knowledge of student history gives him special value in matters of scholarship, degrees, honors, etc., and he finds himself helping to determine policies regarding these matters and in applying the resulting requirements to individual cases. In short,

he becomes a guidance officer who conducts the student personally through the mystery of his admission and the mazes of the curriculum. He shows him how to find his way among the highly specialized and differentiated subjects of study which are offered to him for his delectation or prescribed as a sort of medicine, and teaches him how to weld these subjects into a unified whole.

I do not mean by this that the registrar ever usurps the functions of the director of admissions, the dean, the scholarship adviser, or any other officer of a similar nature, although it is true that many times he fills one or more of those offices as well as his own. But even when he does not, his central position, with the whole of the student's past and present before him, not only recorded but also understood and appreciated, gives to him and to him alone, the duty, the responsibility, and the joy of making of each student's education one single and complete unit.

If the ordinary citizen in the outside world thinks about college registrars at all, as probably he does not unless his boy or girl writes home from college for money to pay a late registration fee or a change of program fee, that citizen probably thinks: "That fellow! Why the students tell him their names and he writes them down, and the teachers tell him their marks and he writes them down, and that's all. A registrar is just a bookkeeper."

Well, perhaps we are—just bookkeepers. But a good bookkeeper knows and understands and interprets his books until he is, in the business whose books he keeps, a central source of financial information and a central source of power in determining the value of the product—and I think nobody would ever say that his function was not a commercial one.

Thus the good registrar. He keeps his records of student history faithfully and truly, he knows and understands and interprets them with justice and with sympathy. And through this knowledge and understanding he becomes not only a central source of educational information, but also a central source of power in determining the value of the product his college sends forth—the educated student.

THE REGISTRAR AND THE QUESTIONNAIRE ADDICT

H. W. CHANDLER

The questionnaire has a distinct and serviceable function when used properly. However, few questionnaires of this type seem to come to most of us, and as a result, the general attitude is one of

antipathy for this medium of interrogation. On receiving a questionnaire, our first impulse is to get rid of it in some way, and this is for the very natural reason that so many of the questionnaires coming under our purview are ambiguous, vague, overlapping, and bad in a number of other ways.

We may first consider some of the inherent evils of the average questionnaire. The composer more than often has drawn up a form which for him may be clear and intelligible, but which means little, nothing, or anything to the receiver. He, the maker, knows the data he wants and how it would be supplied by his institution or department, but often does not consider that the person or institution to whom the questionnaire is sent is not so well acquainted with the field treated, that the institution is of an entirely different nature and constitution, and that the questions put are vague and ambiguous, requiring numerous footnotes for an interpretation of the reply. Most of these evils may be cleared up if those composing questionnaires will do a little research before releasing them. Such research should be in the nature of:

1. Selecting the field (that is, the individuals or institutions) to be questioned, to see that comparable conditions exist there.
2. Composing questions which will have a fair chance of being applicable and intelligible to the receiver of the questionnaire.
3. Making use of catalog material where available, thus obviating the use of the questionnaire in many cases.

Quite frequently the questionnaire is not the proper medium to be used in getting information. A letter is often more intelligible and much easier to handle. The lack of consideration of the questioner in this respect has brought much disfavor upon the questionnaire.

Once the questionnaire has been received, of course, something must be done with it. Several possible dispositions readily come to mind: first, the wastebasket; second, handing it to the first innocent passerby; third, reading the questionnaire and handling it, or giving it to a competent person for handling. The first method, while swift and sure, is probably a bit uncivilized; the second is a licensed form of foul play; and the third, while often burdensome, is the usual practice. However, the respondent, in the light of the faults above mentioned, certainly cannot be expected to spend a great deal of time in answering a questionnaire. Where the questions presented

do not fit his situation except remotely, he should indicate this and let well enough alone.

One discouraging feature in questionnaire answering is that, *prima facie*, the information sought is often of relatively insignificant importance. An expansion of the imagination to the utmost will not reveal any possible use of this information in some cases. Besides this, the respondent must consider the use to which the information supplied will be put. Often he will be shocked and irritated to learn that it has been used in incorrect and unfavorable comparisons, and thus the natural tendency is to shy from questions which can apparently be put to such a use. Questionnaires from accrediting associations and government agencies often come within this latter category.

It may be found expedient to have a member of the registrar's staff handle all questionnaires. If this is done, the individual assigned to such work can accumulate the information usually sought and thus reduce the burden of compiling it each time a questionnaire comes in. He will also become acquainted with questionnaire forms, and reduce the amount of inconsistency in information supplied. Such a procedure will take a considerable burden from the registrar, who will need only to be consulted in cases where information is sought concerning policies of the institution.

It is not surprising that a great deal of ridicule has been placed upon the questionnaire. There is undoubtedly a distinct place for this agent, but more than often its use is abused and its composition unreasonable. If more time is spent on the questionnaire itself, it will follow that more attention will be given to its disposition.

THE REGISTRAR AND HIS HOBBIES

G. P. TUTTLE

Whenever a paper is based on the results of a questionnaire, there must always be some statistical evidence forthcoming or the investigation is conceded to be an utter failure. In this instance, let me get the statistics out of the way promptly. I can give you the cold figures in a half a minute. I sent out 297 copies of a questionnaire asking registrars to state their hobbies. I received 162 replies, which listed 383 hobbies of 139 different varieties. Here endeth, I hope, all statistical material.

I have had a most unusual experience. The replies to every other questionnaire that I have perpetrated have been dead on their feet. They have given information in a staccato voice and as a somewhat begrudged courtesy. This one, however, has been full of life, brimming with enthusiasm, and overflowing with pride of accomplishment in fields far from a registrar's usual bailiwick. This general statement is true in spite of some panning to which I have been subjected. For example, one of the earlier discouragements which I received read as follows: "One of my hobbies is to take a crack, when I can, at a fool idea. When the history of Darn Foolishness in the United States is written, 'The Results of a Questionnaire on the Hobbies of a Registrar' ought to be included." The next letter I opened was more satisfactory. It stated: "What a nice questionnaire this is! It gives me a chance to talk, and you can't interrupt me or answer back. By the way, I believe perhaps talking is a hobby." Needless to say, this came from a woman member of our profession.

Actually I have received every possible sort of reply, from a brief "My wife says my hobby is sleeping at the radio," or "I guess the only registrar who has no hobby is, Yours Sincerely," or "My hobbies are golf, bridge, and detective stories," to a dedicatory poem, entitled "The Tuttle Questionnaire." Here are the first two stanzas:

When the program committee of A. A. C. R.
Was seeking some slight innovation
From trends in admission and grade distribution
And the lure of progressive education,

They framed up a scheme, never thought of before
Termed, "Results from a Brief Questionnaire."
They wanted the hobbies that registrars use
To relieve them of worry and care.

In an article in the *Rotarian* entitled, "Are your hobbies thoroughbred," Mr. Farnsworth Crowder decries the use of leisure for "some feeble occupation hardly distinguishable from tatting." (Ladies, kindly take notice that this article refers entirely to the male of the species as represented in Rotary.) Mr. Crowder then goes on to say: "If hobbies are to catch on as their advocates dream, they must have entrails and challenge and meaning. The avocation that persists and really enriches a man's days is not some bit of spare-time twiddling, but an activity which tends to become more than an avocation, is not anti-job, but another job." He then gives examples

of men who in their leisure time have gone on to professional competence in architecture, botany, ethnology, music, or scholarship—men who have made a hobby “the infancy of ‘another job’.”

What have I found in the returns that would meet such a standard? I should say a good deal, and for a few minutes I should like to describe to you what some registrars have done during their leisure moments that has placed their activities beyond mere recreation, relaxation, or exercise. It is difficult to know where to begin. Possibly a group of activities which I have termed “artistic” is as good a beginning as any. Three registrars have developed skill with the brush and do pretty good work in water colors or oils; two others do charcoal or pencil drawing, though one admits, “My pencil sketches have always found a place in my wastebasket”; one registrar is something of a sculptor, being interested chiefly in statues of historic characters in the United States done in gypsum; two have accomplished something in wood and linoleum block engraving, and one in glass blowing; one writes fiction, and another states that he hopes to write a “tendency novel” when he retires. It may be somewhat surprising that there are five registrars, each of whom has acquired some prominence (mostly local of course) in dramatics—either acting in or directing plays. One has participated in seven performances with three different little theatres in the past two years and is playing the lead this spring in “Captain Applejack.” Two others have a long list of appearances to their credit in such plays as “Androcles and the Lion,” “You Never Can Tell,” “Mr. Pim Passes By,” “The Importance of Being Ernest,” “Trelawney of the Wells,” plays by Shakespeare, etc. The others find their chief pleasure in directing plays, one being director of all major productions of the Little Theatre group in a city of considerable size. We have one registrar who conducts a symphony orchestra, another who has written an adaptation of Chinese Temple chants that has been used successfully by his college choir and who is at present working on a Chinese operetta which is almost finished, and a third who has organized two Grand Opera companies in one of the largest cities in the country. I have already mentioned one writer of rambling verse. We have another who goes in for poetry of a serious vein and has had published a book of translations of Chinese classical poetry entitled, “From Bamboo Glade and Lotus Pool,” which won the Verse Craft Manuscript Contest for 1934. I have a sample of one of his poems, “The Great Wall Speaks,” which I would like to

read but time does not permit. If you are interested, you will find it in *Verse Craft* for September-October, 1935.

There is another group of hobbies which I shall classify rather loosely as educational. There are five of our number who find pleasure in spending leisure hours in language study. One has taken as a hobby the study of Canadian French and writes, "This gives me a reasonable excuse for travel in French Canada and my motives for this summer migration were not questioned even during our era of prohibition." One registrar who formerly taught Latin and Greek has mastered Spanish and Italian in his leisure time. Another who spent eleven years in China finds recreation in trying to keep up a reading knowledge of the language. The fifth has this to say about his language study:

During my first four years in the registrar's office, I continued the serious study of Greek and Latin with the primary object of securing ready facility in reading the literature. At the same time, I endeavored to improve my ability to read French and German. After extensive study in the literature of these four languages, I then turned to other modern languages, and by beginning the study of a new language every two or three years I have succeeded to date in learning how to read enjoyably in Italian, Spanish, and Russian. In the near future I expect to undertake the study of Japanese. I find this hobby most interesting and stimulating. Each new language opens up an entirely new world of thought and expression in which I can quickly and easily forget the "arduous duties of a registrar."

Ever since his high school days one registrar has had an interest in cryptograms and ciphers. This interest has developed from being a hobby to the full grown stature of a piece of professional research. He is now very seriously at work upon research which he believes will prove that Francis Bacon used a cipher in some of his early editions. The results of this work will be published in a volume explaining how the cipher may be decoded when the second key has not been given.

We have among our number three amateur astronomers. One has ground a six inch mirror and constructed a telescope with which he says, "I amuse my friends." The other states that he has "embarked upon the manufacture of an amateur reflecting telescope."

And here is a registrar who states: "Before I became a professor or a registrar I was employed in the Division of Terrestrial Magnetism of the U. S. Coast and Geodetic Survey, and I still sometimes revert to type in the summer time, leave my office in charge of my assistant, and become a magnetic observer again. I have occupied

more than one hundred magnetic stations in about twenty different states. This furnishes a real change of scene and occupation and I always come back from a trip refreshed and invigorated."

If you want something different, I suggest that you try politics. One registrar finding himself getting stale on the job, about to "crack up" as he put it, became interested in town affairs, served six years as a selectman. This led to election as a Representative to the State Legislature. He has been re-elected four times, has served on the Committee on Appropriations (registrars of state universities, take note), has been largely instrumental in gaining legislation for the construction of a \$1,500,000 bridge, gave the address at the dedication of the bridge, and is on the State Planning and Development Commission.

Apparently registrars do not go in greatly for inventions. They make various things including tables, chairs, ash trays, summer cottages, toys, and garden implements. But only one admits an invention. He states: "My one successful invention to date is a one-hand match box for real matches (i.e., matches with which a pipe can be 'lit successful,' in that it works)."

Registrars during their leisure hours read a great deal both for pleasure and profit. None of the reading reported has the slightest connection with the registrar and his job. Evidently such reading is work to the registrar. One registrar states: "The reading must meet the following tests: it must have form, dimension, length, body but no depth, no weight or specific gravity."

Not all registrars would agree with this, however. One finds pleasure in reading history, biography, historical novels, and the Bible in both French and German. Another plans systematic reading for the year. One year it will be history, another year science, and so on. A third plans his reading by historical periods. He has covered the Tudor Period, the French Revolution, the Russian Revolution, and Pre-Victorian England.

However, more registrars spend their leisure time out-of-doors than any other way. In order of frequency, the registrar enjoys golf, motoring, fishing, hiking, tennis, and horseback riding. No boasts are made as to golf scores and no unbelievable fish stories are related. One registrar states that he has been caught only once by a game warden. Some registrars find relaxation in the care and breeding of animals. Two registrars raise dogs, doberman pinschers; one is devoted to his flock of Shropshire sheep and states, "I have

improved the flock until today they rank among the highest grade." Another who describes his two acre patch as a ranch, goes in for cows and chickens. Still another who divides his time between New Zealand rabbits and Silver Laced Wyandottes has won two firsts with his poultry at the larger poultry shows of his state.

Gardening in season is the registrar's chief delight. I should judge that about two thirds of us have some sort of a garden and while the registrar remains silent about his golf score, he waxes eloquent with respect to his garden and, I fear, less truthful than one might wish.

Of course no statement of hobbies would be complete without mention of the collector. Twenty-four registrars reported that they have collections of various sorts. Some of the more unusual collections may be of interest, idiosyncrasies received through the mail, antiques (of course), old hand arms, old letters and maps, antique dolls, American Indian Art.

I could give you quotations by the page from the very interesting and amusing replies which I have received. I think you would find as much delight in them as I have found. I feel since studying the returns that I know my fellow registrars much better than I have ever known them before. They have given me an insight into the way they live and the things they do, and they have done it with a delicate humor and a frankness that is worthy of a master hand. One reply is so out of harmony with the general tone that I want to give it to you in closing (it is worth thinking about) and to place it along side of another reply which to me represents quite remarkable accomplishments.

The first one reads: "If I were not a 'full-time' registrar I think I would probably like to sit in the shade for a time and try to discover what is really significant in life and 'let the world go by.' Other possibilities might be tramping and fishing, horseback riding, carpentry, travel, and possibly the care of certain animals."

Here is the cry of a poor soul unable to find time for relaxation, pleasure, or broadening education. I wonder what is wrong in this picture?

Let me present in contrast the statement of a man, nearing the close of a very active career of forty years at one of the country's most respected universities. His reply to my questionnaire is a two-page typewritten letter. Here are some of the things he has done:

1. Designed and built, without the aid of architect or general

builder, his two and one-half story house, including all grading, gardening, and planning.

2. Organized and managed many charities, fraternities, and masonic bodies.

3. Organized and managed open air pageants and plays.

4. Organized two grand opera companies and directed one.

5. Collected a library of the publications of his university and her sons which now numbers over 15,000 books and pamphlets.

6. Collected hundreds of manuscripts, letters, etc., and relics of eminent Unitarians, and objects bearing upon the history of his university.

7. Traveled in all parts of the world and in many out of the way places such as Spitzbergen and Alaska.

He then goes on to say:

From the above, you will realize that I switched hobbies occasionally, but out of every one of them I have gotten a full measure of enjoyment and recreation. The one that appeals to me most, however, is that of making our home. There is hardly any bit of garden about the home which does not represent a great deal of personal labor, but always a labor of love, such as the building of roads, dry walls, rock gardens, pools, fountain, flower gardens, shrubbery, trees, etc.—there is not a room or any part of the interior of our home that does not have a personal touch. They constitute a constant reminder of happy hours and days spent in their creation. This includes the painting, color scheme, furnishings, etc:

The above may sound as though I had neglected the University work, but I assure you that all of these hobbies have been ridden without sacrificing any of my many duties at the University. I am now looking forward to retiring within a few years, when I may ride other hobbies or complete some that I have not finished. I am especially looking forward to getting some leisure for writing.

Symposium

The Registrar as an Administrator

E. J. HOWELL, CHAIRMAN

CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE OFFICE OF REGISTRAR TO THE STUDENT PERSONNEL PROGRAM AT INDIANA STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE

H. E. ELDER

Prior to the first appearance of the word "personnel" in college circles, about 1917, the office of registrar of the average institution was nearly always highly impersonal and factual. The registrar himself was a bookkeeper who gave little thought to the relation of his work to the selective admission and retention of students; he did not devote his efforts very largely to the conservation and development of personality. Students came and went; records were kept; and inflexible regulations were applied uniformly and mechanically.

With the introduction of the testing and guidance movements, a new leaven appeared which has greatly changed procedures in the registrar's office as well as in all other departments of a college. In progressive institutions of 1936 personnel work is a major function, co-ordinate in importance and unity with classroom instruction and financial administration. Along with other departments the registrar's office recognizes individual differences and attempts to promote more complete self-realization on the part of each student; it accepts as a major premise that to discover, conserve, and develop personalities and potentialities is the *raison d'être* of any personnel or educational program.

At Indiana State Teachers College the Registrar's office confines its efforts largely to the problems of admissions, registration and records, student programs, and placement. An earnest attempt is made to keep in proper perspective, protect, and co-ordinate the best interests of college students, teacher employing officials, and the children of the public schools of the State of Indiana. Although the activities of the office are constantly overlapping and deeply and intimately interwoven with the personnel work of every other department of the college, they may be divided, for purposes of discussion, into three groups; those at or near the time of admission,

those during the period of residence, and those near or following graduation.

ACTIVITIES AT TIME OF ADMISSION

The Registrar's office attempts to make the transition from high school to college as easy and natural as possible. Because college instructors must become thoroughly acquainted with the background of new students if they are to teach them effectively from the beginning, such information concerning incoming freshmen is indispensable. To assist teachers to know the members of their classes, to extend to some degree the college guidance program into the constituent high schools, and to secure data for guiding students during college life, an eight-page Application for Admission is used. This blank consists of three parts: Part I—General Information; Part II—Personal Qualifications; Part III—Scholarship Standing and Certificate of Recommendation.

Under "General Information" the student furnishes pertinent data concerning his family, special interests, achievements, ambitions, ideals, hobbies, health, and financial status. The high school principal supplies the information requested in the second and third parts. By checking appropriate positions on horizontal lines in Part II, the principal indicates his evaluation of the student with respect to "scholastic zeal," "intellectual ability and aptitude," "initiative," "integrity," "leadership ability," "social attitude," and "emotional control"; he also makes other suggestions which he deems necessary to the intelligent interpretation of the student's high school or college record. Part III consists of the high school scholarship record and scores made on standard achievement and mental tests. The confidential nature of the data is preserved by having the principal send the completed Application for Admission directly to the Registrar's office.

Within a month after the opening of the fall quarter of the regular college year, the information secured as outlined above is analyzed and each member of the faculty is furnished ten ratings on each freshman as follows: high school record, scope of extra-curriculum interests, financial status, and the seven personal traits evaluated by the high school principal in Part II of the admission blank. At the same time the complete Application for Admission is made accessible to all faculty members for special reference as necessary. In this manner an attempt is made to contribute to the ideal situa-

tion in which every staff member is a personnel worker striving to make Indiana State Teachers College as nearly as possible a genuine human engineering agency rather than a mechanical mill for the manufacture of stereotyped robots to "keep" school in Indiana.

Of major significance in the program to discover, conserve, and develop human values and personalities at Indiana State Teachers College is Freshman Orientation Week. The program for this week involves the entire staff and, in a general way, acquaints the prospective student with all phases of college life. In addition to mass meeting for instructions and announcements in connection with registration, English placement tests, and psychological and physical examinations, small groups of from fifteen to twenty each meet for at least ten half-hour periods with faculty members for intimate and personal discussions of college problems. In these small group meetings the office of the Registrar is responsible for the explanation of its guidance services available to all students, the various curriculums and graduation requirements of the college, the free placement service to former students and graduates, and general college regulations. The student is made to feel that he is an important and integral part of the college organization and that, regardless of what problems may confront him at any time, there is some one on the college staff able and eager to assist him.

Even previous to Orientation Week—throughout August and early September—the Registrar's office is busily engaged with the guidance of freshmen. Parents and prospective students telephone, write, and present themselves in person to learn of costs, part-time employment, curriculums, programs, and registration. Throughout this period and continuing until the day of registration, beginning and returning students submit proposed schedules or trial programs to be followed during the fall quarter. Because many problems confront him, the construction of his first program is a difficult undertaking for a freshman. Curriculums, courses, sequences, and college levels must be understood and applied to his individual situation. Often a student cannot continue all of his high school interests and hobbies and a choice must be made from many conflicting desires: he must confine himself to a curriculum with its component majors and graduation requirements. On the other hand, he may find upon self-inspection that he has no dominating interest; one curriculum or major seems as good as another and he wants advice—he wants to know which procedure is most likely to bring him profitable employment upon graduation. Only after receiving much individual

attention is he able to plan his first quarter's work; but it is frequently this attention which helps to determine the success and happiness of a college career.

ACTIVITIES DURING TIME OF RESIDENCE

During the student's residence in college, the Registrar's office remains in constant touch with his progress and advises him at regular intervals on graduation, license, and major requirements. Before registration for any quarter his trial program is checked and approved. In many instances an entire year's work is planned in every detail in advance. By the time the student has been in college a year he is furnished an "estimate"—an exact statement of "work done" and "work to do" on a given curriculum. Frequently a student, after he has earned considerable credit, wishes to change from one curriculum to another or is undecided as to which of several curriculums to complete; in such a case, several "estimates" are necessary at the same time. Through sympathetic attention at these times, a student may be saved from failure or discouragement. By keeping these statements of current standing in the hands of students, by furnishing to each student a quarterly statement of the quality of his work in the form of a scholarship index, and by offering continuous service in program construction, much more individual attention is given than would be possible if all such guidance were either decentralized or attempted at the time of registration.

In addition to the attention given the individual students, data based upon records of freshmen in college are furnished to high school principals in an effort to unify personnel programs on the secondary school and college levels. Not only does a high school principal receive the grades of a college freshman from his school, but also he receives a statement of the average scholastic standing in college of students from his school in relation to corresponding averages of students from other schools. Such information, together with the Application for Admission to Indiana State Teachers College enables the secondary schools to render more effective guidance in helping students choose their vocations as well as the institutions to enter for preparation.

ACTIVITIES NEAR TIME OF GRADUATION

At least one quarter before the student expects to finish, he files a formal application for graduation. In acknowledgment of this application, he receives a "graduation letter" which is a final state-

ment of the requirements—academic, financial, etc.—which the college expects him to meet. At the same time his name is placed upon the list of prospective graduates, a diploma is prepared for him, he is furnished a form for use in making application for his license to the State Department of Education, he is offered the services of the college placement bureau, and he is given suggestions compiled by the faculty placement committee on the correct procedure and the professional ethics of securing a position. If he accepts the placement service, he gives the necessary data—including several references—on blanks prepared for the purpose. The placement bureau then secures statements from his references and prepares at least five copies of all such data to use, both before and following graduation, in presenting his qualifications to prospective employing officials. Just as the transition from high school to college is made as simple and easy as possible in the beginning, the placement service attempts to transfer the individual from the college to a teaching position for which his preparation and personality best qualify him. In other words, the Registrar's office extends a welcoming and helping hand to the freshman when he enters, assists other departments of the college in his guidance while he remains, and attempts to start him on a successful professional career when he leaves.

SUMMARY

E. J. HOWELL

I. *The Registrar's Relationship in Administration and Research to Institutional Finance and Budget Making.* H. E. Elder, Indiana State Teachers College.

In the Indiana State Teachers College, the Registrar secures information valuable in institutional finance and budget-making by routine work dealing with admissions, registration and record keeping, student's programs, and placement; by membership and work on several standing faculty policy-forming and policy-recommending committees; by membership and work on the administrative council; and by special studies. In the financial administration and the preparation of the budget, the Registrar estimates the income from contingent fees and with the President, Dean, and Business Manager as the Administrative Council makes the budget.

In the discussion of the topic, Mr. A. C. Nelson, of the University of Denver, stated that the problem becomes one in which the regis-

trar should be an integrating factor particularly in the large institutions. The method of predicting enrolment was discussed by several, and Mr. W. J. Harris, of the University of Wisconsin, outlined their method of using information secured from the testing program of high school seniors.

II. *The Registrar's Relationship in Administration and Research to Curriculum Problems.* R. F. Thomason, University of Tennessee.

In presenting this topic, Mr. Thomason stated that a registrar should be interested in curriculum problems and pointed out wherein he has a wonderful opportunity to serve his institution in their solution. As the admissions officer, the registrar knows intimately the high school offerings and offerings in other colleges. He is one of the few administrative officers whose interest is primarily academic and at the same time surveys the institution (academically) in all its aspects. His familiarity with curriculum requirements and his contacts with students, faculty, parents, high school principals, and others give him valuable information in the solution of curriculum problems. The registrar's office is a storehouse of the very best material with which to attack curriculum problems.

Miss Helen Burgoyne, of the University of Cincinnati, in discussing the topic, pointed out that the registrar is in a position to study the trends in high schools and colleges and can help to keep his institution abreast of the times. As custodian of the records, he has a veritable gold mine of information within his grasp but, like gold, it has to be dug up and put into circulation to be of any real use. Mr. F. T. Jones, of Drew University, called attention to the fact that the registrar, being on a large number of committees, is in a strategic position to render service to his institution in the solution of curriculum problems.

III. *The Registrar's Relationship in Administration and Research to Student Life.* Miss Mary A. Robertson, University of Alabama.

It is difficult to paint a distinctive picture of the registrar. The range of functions and the applications of functions depend, of course, upon the size of the college, its history and traditions, and the personality of the registrar. The problem of painting a picture of student life is even more difficult. As director of admissions, the registrar is considered by the prospective student, to a certain

extent, as the *Institution*. In the matter of directing registration activities, he can play an important part in student life particularly in humanizing the registration machinery. Since constructive educational guidance depends upon accurate and comprehensive information regarding students, the registrar plays no small part in personnel work. His intimate circle should include the students as well as the faculty.

Mr. R. F. Thomason, of the University of Tennessee, stated in the discussion of the topic that he had a very fine opportunity in his institution to give proper guidance as the students came to the office for information with reference to their academic standing. Mr. S. L. McGraw, of the Concord State Teachers College, reported that his institution was using the cumulative record and furnishing each student with a copy at the end of each semester.

IV. *The Registrar's Relationship in Administration and Research to a Sustained and Professional Growth of the Faculty.* C. S. Wilkins, John Tarleton Agricultural College.

In presenting this topic, Mr. Wilkins pointed out that the registrar should be a leader among the faculty in research for furthering professional standards. His office should serve as a clearing house of information on research work bearing on student personnel and academic achievement. He should have some responsibility in disseminating information regarding research being conducted by the faculty. The maintenance in his office of an accurate and systematic set of records showing growth of the faculty in research and academic attainments should help the registrar in his relationship to a sustained and professional growth of the faculty.

Mr. E. J. Mathews, of the University of Texas, in a discussion of the topic, pointed out that the registrar's opportunity is in publishing things and making studies of the material in his office that will direct the attention of members of the faculty to phases of their work that often escape their attention.

SECTIONAL MEETINGS

Section A—Universities, Professional and Technical Schools

EDITH D. COCKINS, CHAIRMAN

(PANEL DISCUSSION)

EDITOR'S NOTE:—Except in the panel discussion, the only presentations published were those which were submitted in manuscript form. The summaries by the chairmen cover the others.

MISS COCKINS: I want you to know the members of the panel and I shall introduce them, beginning at this end of the table. Mr. Bixler of the University of Chicago, Mr. Christensen, Comptroller of the University of Michigan, Mr. Quick of the University of Pittsburgh, Mr. West of the University of Minnesota, Mr. Tuttle of the University of Illinois, Mr. Mitchell of Stanford University, Mr. Smith of the University of Michigan, Mr. Sage of Iowa State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, Mr. Leshner of the University of Arizona, Mr. Hagemeyer of Teachers College, Columbia University, and Mr. MacKinnon of Massachusetts Institute of Technology. You see the panel covers the country from Coast to Coast and from Minnesota to Arizona.

There is no field of activity that has experienced more changes in the past decade or two than the field of education. There are many new trends and some of these trends have become tides and some of the tides have become flood tides. Before the World War, educational methods and curricula had proceeded on an even keel for many years. The fixed curriculum, with a few electives, was the pattern that was generally followed and all students followed that pattern, whether or not it fitted their needs. Psychology was taught in all of our colleges, but experimental psychology was in its infancy.

Then came the World War and our huge army camps were composed of thousands of civilians that had never had a day of military training, men from all walks of life, and many of them with very little education. It was necessary to classify these men in the camps and our psychologists were soon in uniform, giving the benefit of their experience in helping to get this great army of civilians organized for service. And after the War, when the psychologists returned to academic halls, they urged that the methods of testing intelli-

gence that had been used and tried in the testing of the men in the civilian camps be used in testing the general intelligence of the entering freshmen.

I shall never forget the debate in our own faculty over the adoption of this method of testing college students. The faculty was game, however, and decided to try the tests first on themselves. After the examination was over, I remember the dismay of certain faculty members who were very deliberate in their movements and who were most disturbed because the bell had rung before they had completed half of many of the questions.

We have come a long way since those early days of using these tests. The outgrowth of the tests was the recognition of the individual and of the fact that the same curriculum could not be successfully followed for each individual. So the pendulum began to swing in the opposite direction and has swung from the fixed curriculum to the other extreme of individual instruction, such as we find at Sarah Lawrence College and at Bennington College. It is a recognition of the ability of the student to control his own rate and standard of progress and this recognition has invaded not only academic fields but also elementary and secondary education as well. It has brought the introduction of independent work, reading for honors, and the leaving of the control of the student's progress largely in his own hands.

The heart of the system is the faculty adviser and also the tutor who directs the student's work, stimulating him in his efforts, and correlating the work in different fields. It is the curriculum built to fit the individual needs of the student. This has led to the use of the comprehensive examination to test the student's real grasp of the field of study rather than of a single course.

There is another problem that has confronted many institutions. The depression has brought to the campus of many of the large universities, and particularly the publicly supported institutions, many young people who have not been able to find any employment and who do not care to qualify for a degree, but have the desire to increase their general knowledge and to go beyond the secondary schools. This has brought about, in many places, a new experiment, the General College. Industry and science have made all of their progress through experiment. The big industrial concerns always set aside a certain amount of money for experimental purposes. This has not been true in education and so each institu-

tion is trying its own experiments. There are almost as many experiments as there are institutions.

One of the first institutions to establish the general college program was the University of Minnesota. I suppose Mr. West has had more experience with the organization and the management of the general college than any other registrar in the room. Mr. West, will you tell us, please, something of the organization of the General College at Minnesota, how your applicants are admitted and anything else that you care to give us?

MR. WEST: The General College organization is very simple and I think the easiest way in which I can present it to you is merely to state the objectives described in the Bulletin. It is intended for 7 groups of students, "those who desire to pursue courses or curricula not offered in other colleges; those who, for financial or other reasons, have only a limited time to give to college training; those who need and wish general orientation in the choice of, and general preparation for, a vocation; those who do not satisfactorily meet the entrance requirements of the other colleges because of lack of training in specific subjects; those who transfer from other institutions or who do not meet the standards for advanced standing of the college to which they apply; those who are transferred by mutual agreement of the General College or University and the college in which they propose to register or are registered; and seventh, those who might not be accepted by existing colleges because of a lack of preparation."

If there are any other objectives of any other college or of the University, we have not discovered them yet, but, at any rate, the General College is open to any student who desires less than the normal four-year course for a degree, or who feels that he will not be able to spend the time to follow a four-year degree course.

As a matter of fact, approximately 30 per cent enter the General College because of one of these particular reasons. Another 30 per cent is made up of students who are advised to take some work in the General College because of their performance in high school and who may feel the need of a further period of orientation before entering a professional or a specialized curriculum; and the balance is made up largely of students who have entered one of the other colleges and who have been unsuccessful, or have found they have been in the wrong place, or have been trying to do the wrong thing, and would rather go into the General College than go home. Many

of those recoup and go back into some other college and make good.

The General College is not a course so organized as to prevent the student from going on toward a four-year degree. A limited number of students—I say limited because I presume it amounts to 10 per cent or 15 per cent—transfer to the other colleges and work toward a four-year degree. We have accepted students in our Law School, where we require two years of pre-professional work, from the General College and have recognized that General College work as equivalent to the usual course. A very small number of those have been successful. We have accepted some in our School of Business Administration on a similar basis, and a somewhat larger group has been successful. We recognize the work as being different from the standard Arts College preparation but we do not believe that because it is different, it is any less effective training.

MISS COCKINS: What are the entrance requirements to the General College?

MR. WEST: The entrance requirements are graduation from a secondary school with a minimum of twelve senior high school units, which is the same as for the Arts College, but without the special group or subject-matter requirements.

MR. SMITH: What is the general attitude of the high school principals of your state with regard to your General College?

MR. WEST: We have some place for the students to go who are not in the upper ranks of the high school classes. How long we shall continue on that basis, I do not know, but our Board of Admissions, as a matter of fact, is conducting an experimental project to determine whether or not this absence of group requirements and specific subjects has any relation to the performance of these students after they enter college.

MR. TUTTLE: Since the establishment of the General College, have you definitely excluded from admission to your Liberal Arts College, for example, and from the other colleges, students who rank in the lower part of their high school classes?

MR. WEST: No. Such students are recommended to try the General College, but any student who wishes to enter and who has met the entrance requirements of the other colleges may still enter.

MR. TUTTLE: What is the nature of your requirement for advancement in the General College and how long may a student remain there?

MR. WEST: The General College has no credits, honor points, or

any of the usual things that constitute education as commonly understood. We require for graduation the passing of six comprehensive examinations. Grades in individual subjects have no significance. On passing six comprehensive examinations, the candidate receives an Associate in Arts degree, which is the usual certificate given by junior colleges.

MEMBER: Suppose a student lacks certain subject requirements and you take him into the General College and he does a year of good work. Can he, then, transfer to one of the other colleges and go ahead with sophomore standing?

MR. WEST: Yes, he can transfer at any time the work is satisfactory, if he has completed a full year of work.

MISS COCKINS: Who gives these general comprehensive examinations?

MR. WEST: They are given through the Bureau of Educational Research. The examinations are set up by the Educational Research Committee in co-operation with the instructor; they are scored by the Bureau and reported to our office for record.

MR. SMITH: Do the members of the faculty feel that the examinations are adequate and sufficient?

MR. WEST: I cannot speak for the faculty without speaking on both sides of the question but, as a rule, they are willing to accept them.

MR. TUTTLE: Could you explain in a few words the nature of the curriculum in the General College?

MR. WEST: There is no curriculum. The courses are all so-called survey courses or, as Dr. MacLean, the Director of the College, prefers to call them, overview courses. A student may take any combination of those courses that he pleases. To give you some idea of the type of course, they include such things as Earth and Man, Social Problem Studies, Background of the Modern World, Basic Wealth, World Literature, Formation of Public Opinion, Introduction to Philosophy, How to Study, Physical Education and Euthenics, Vocations, etc. They do not correspond in subject-matter with the usual Arts College course.

MISS COCKINS: How many students are enrolled in the General College?

MR. WEST: About 800.

MISS COCKINS: Are they taught in large or in small sections?

MR. WEST: They are taught in large lecture sections. They use

visual presentation for a great deal of their work—talkies and movies.

MISS COCKINS: Are the students divided into small groups for quizzing?

MR. WEST: No.

MR. SAGE: Is any laboratory work required?

MR. WEST: None except in writing.

MISS COCKINS: Does anybody in the audience desire to ask Mr. West a question?

QUESTION: Do students transfer from the General College to institutions?

MR. WEST: We have some that transfer. The receiving college never understands the transcript. Those who have tried to transfer from our institution to other institutions are the ones who have usually been refused transfer to our own institution, and I should say to any of you who have applicants from our General College that you can protect yourself by asking them to present a recommendation for transfer from the University. If they do not have such a recommendation, you accept them at your own peril.

MR. GLADFELTER: Is there a set pattern for these courses?

MR. WEST: There is no pattern. They select the courses, with an adviser.

MR. GLADFELTER: If a student transfers from the General College at the end of the first year, how do you determine what credit he shall have for the work he has completed?

MR. WEST: A student who has completed a full year of work in the General College and transfers to the Arts College and does a year of satisfactory work in the Arts College may receive one year of blanket advanced standing for his work in the General College.

MISS COCKINS: Is this credit given immediately, or is it provisional credit?

MR. WEST: It is provisional credit, subject to a year of satisfactory work.

QUESTION: Do you have any students with good high school records who prefer to enter the General College on account of the nature of the work?

MR. WEST: Yes, we do.

MISS COCKINS: Are other students admitted to these same survey courses?

MR. WEST: Yes. As a matter of fact, in the College of Education,

a considerable part of the first-year work in the physical education and art education curricula is selected from the General College offerings.

MISS COCKINS: Then the standards are practically the same?

MR. WEST: I cannot answer that question, because the results of the comprehensive examinations are reported in terms of percentile ranks and that means that the standard depends upon the average of the class.

MISS COCKINS: In what divisions are those six comprehensives?

MR. WEST: There are ten altogether that are offered, of which a student must pass six for the Associate in Arts degree. They are contemporary affairs, history and government studies, economic studies, social problem studies, psychology studies, euthenic studies, art studies, physical science studies, biological science studies, oral and written communication studies.

MISS COCKINS: While there is no pattern, does not the fact that there are six courses like that tend to give some balance to the program?

MR. WEST: Yes, there is some balance. That is governed by the adviser to some extent, depending upon the individual student's objective and his own interest. I should say that we have a very effective plan of counseling in connection with the General College, and the value of that plan is now being studied under a special grant from the General Education Board.

MR. STRADLEY: Now that you have this General College, are you glad that you have it?

MR. WEST: I think that it is still an experiment and I would rather answer that question a couple of years from now.

MISS COCKINS: This General College in Minnesota is not the only experiment in colleges that we have. Mr. Hagemeyer, may I ask you to tell us something about the New College at Teachers College at Columbia?

Mr. Hagemeyer read a paper on New College, which was established at Teachers College, Columbia University, in the fall of 1932. He explained the plan of the curriculum and emphasized certain novel features such as the community projects, the period of internship and the method of keeping records. Since these questions are thoroughly discussed in a paper by Professor Paul Limbert of New College entitled "Guiding the Progress of Students in New College" which has already been published in the *Bulletin of the American*

Association of Collegiate Registrars for April, 1936, Mr. Hagemeyer's paper is not included here.

MISS COCKINS: What is the degree?

MR. HAGEMEYER: The degree is the Bachelor of Science.

MR. WEST: Is there any objection on the part of the New York State Board of Regents?

MR. HAGEMEYER: No. They have approved the curriculum. They are very enthusiastic about the plan, and especially the internship features.

MR. WEST: How is the selection made?

MR. HAGEMEYER: On the basis of high school graduation, with a minimum of $12\frac{1}{2}$ units, and outstanding records. We utilize the Columbia University entrance examinations and other tests if we think it desirable.

MR. WEST: But they are accepted for the freshman year?

MR. HAGEMEYER: Yes.

MR. WEST: You say five years. Do the five years include internship?

MR. HAGEMEYER: Five calendar years. That includes the travel in Europe, the period in industry, at the Community, and the internship.

MR. TUTTLE: Are any subsidies offered to students of limited means who show promise?

MR. HAGEMEYER: Yes. There are also various ways in which they can earn their way. For instance, they may stay at the Community for a longer period than one summer, remaining as workers, in which case they are paid for the extra time.

QUESTION: What is the tuition?

MR. HAGEMEYER: The tuition is the same as it is in the rest of the College.

MR. SMITH: Where are they placed for this internship year?

MR. HAGEMEYER: They may go anywhere in the country. They may be in the vicinity of New York and we have had some out in Oregon and Washington and other distant places.

MR. SMITH: That is an arrangement with the school?

MR. HAGEMEYER: With the local school board, yes.

MR. TUTTLE: How long has New College been in operation?

MR. HAGEMEYER: Since 1932.

MR. TUTTLE: Do students have course work while they are abroad?

MR. HAGEMEYER: They are with an instructor and working under his supervision all the time. There are no formal courses but he guides their study.

MR. TUTTLE: About how many students do you admit each year?

MR. HAGEMEYER: The student body is limited to about 350, which means about 90 to a class.

MR. TUTTLE: Co-educational?

MR. HAGEMEYER: Yes.

MR. SMITH: Do many of them transfer to other institutions?

MR. HAGEMEYER: Very few. I do not know whether any of you had any experiences with New College transcripts or not, but if you have, you certainly would know about it.

MEMBER: A young woman was transferred in September and she believed she should be entitled to junior standing. Dr. Bowles told me I should write to you for more information about it.

MR. HAGEMEYER: I think it would be better to write to Dr. Snyder of New College. She would be able to send you a sort of summary which might help you.

MISS COCKINS: Thank you, Mr. Hagemeyer.

The junior college had its beginning in California and I presume there is no one in this organization who has had as much experience with junior college transfers as Mr. Mitchell of Stanford. Will you tell us very briefly, Mr. Mitchell, whether the junior college is a menace to the liberal arts college?

MR. MITCHELL: Miss Cockins has given me a rather difficult topic, because it is not one that could be answered with a "Yes" or "No." It involves a good deal of educational speculation. I do not think I can answer the question in the form in which it is put and I should like to change it a little. I should rather say, "Have the developments which have led to the organization of two-year colleges proved a challenge to the old type, the four-year arts college?" Wording it that way, I think I can answer, "Yes, they have." These developments have proved a very definite challenge to the four-year arts college. Whether it is a menace or not depends upon our point of view and our connections to some extent.

Now, let me just take a minute to try to sketch what I mean by these developments which have led to the organization of the two-year college. The point of view as to a two-year college is entirely different on the Pacific Coast from what it is on the Atlantic Coast. The junior college is not an artificial scheme that somebody

thought up to thrust into a well-organized educational system to make a lot of trouble. It grew up, at least in my part of the country, as a natural, orderly response to an educational need. The area there is one of increasing population, increasing in people of means—of some means, at least—who want to educate their children, and the educational system proved inadequate to continue the education of large numbers of young people beyond the high school period. There was a definite urge on the part of the youngsters and their parents to carry them beyond that point and something had to be provided for it.

When I tell you that there are now in the State of California some 34 tax-supported junior colleges, accommodating some 25,000 students, you can see that it is a growth which could not have been met by any existing institution. We know that no university, however large it might be, would want to take on even half of 25,000 freshmen and sophomores. It just is not in the picture. So the junior college is something which has come from the roots up and is a development which has, of course, brought many questions into the field of the typical four-year arts college. That is the development on the one side.

On the other side has come the development of professional education, where the student more and more feels the training required; for law and medicine and engineering and the sciences and teaching and business have all taken on something of a professional angle, which has gone down into the four-year college period. We expect our young people to make up their minds somewhere near the end of the sophomore year, at least to some extent, where they are going. That is the pressure from the other side, and the old-fashioned, typical four-year liberal arts college is right in the middle—between those two pressures.

The junior college performs another function. We all know that in our colleges there are a lot of people who should stop before they try to graduate, but the four-year program offers no facilities for a graceful exit until the end of the four years, and the junior college does perform a very important function in this connection. It offers in its best form extensive terminal courses for those that want to go on to the end of the period of secondary education and stop with something that serves them well, and the usual courses for the others who want to go on through the ordinary A.B. degree course and perhaps on into the professional schools.

Now, that sifting that is done in the junior college period is an important function of that institution. You see, then, why I call it a challenge to the four-year liberal college. How is the liberal college going to meet these needs? It can, of course, do the work of the junior college and do it well. That is largely teaching, and things can be well taught in a great many ways in a great many places.

The challenge comes—what of the junior and senior years? Can it meet the demands of those going on into professional schools? Can it offer the type of instruction which men need who want to go on into the junior and senior years of liberal arts work and stop? Many will find it difficult to do that without the type of faculty that demands some opportunity for graduate work.

Now, this is one of the challenges to the liberal arts college. That has no doubt been met successfully by many of them. I doubt that it can be met by all. Some may find it more economical to try to do a good job as a junior college but, wording the question in that way, "Has it proved a challenge?" I think the safe answer is "Yes."

MISS COCKINS: Mr. Mitchell, are there junior colleges in California connected with the large high schools?

MR. MITCHELL: There are three general kinds. There is the kind that is associated with the high school district. There is the kind that is a county junior college, supported by the county, and may or may not be affiliated with the high schools in any way. There is also what is known as the district junior college, where an area, perhaps parts of different counties or parts of different school districts, have clubbed together and organized a junior college district and maintain their own junior college. There are those three different types; all are existing side by side. I spoke of it as an area of educational experimentation because they are trying all sorts of ways of doing it. We do not know very much yet about how best to teach freshmen and sophomores, and there is a great deal of very interesting experimentation going on in that district.

MISS COCKINS: How successful are these young people when they come to college, transferring from the junior college? Are they well prepared?

MR. MITCHELL: Well, it is difficult to say. Our first experience was very good, indeed. Recently, the record of the junior college transfers to our particular institution, as a whole group, is not as

good as it was five years ago. But if you analyze the group closely, you find just as many good ones as we ever had, but it has been diluted a little by a less rigorous selection on the part of some of the colleges. I should say that, on the whole, the records are satisfactory. We have learned by experience to distinguish between the grading systems necessarily used in different communities, and in that way we are able to admit, every year, considerable numbers of really successful graduates of these various junior colleges.

MR. WEST: Is it true that the student who selects the semi-professional course cannot continue in college?

MR. MITCHELL: That is the general understanding. The largest one in the State is the Los Angeles Junior College. They have developed the terminal course feature to a very marked extent. I believe that 75 per cent of their students are in semi-professional courses. The understanding is that they are not to be given any advanced standing by the University of California, or by any other university. If you ever get transcripts from that particular college, the semi-professional work, by common agreement, does not carry advanced standing. Does that answer your question?

MR. WEST: It answers my question but it does not answer my conscience. A student who presents a credit in psychology from a semi-professional course, from the same teacher who taught the same course in a collegiate curriculum, in my opinion, should be able to count that credit toward a degree.

MR. MITCHELL: You are right. He should; but the semi-professional courses are usually in different classes and given under different conditions and they are not supposed to be leading on into the University.

Now, there is a principle accepted in the area with one or two softenings. For instance, take a specific case. A man comes to me who has had two years of first-class work in the semi-professional courses in this particular Junior College. He does not get any advanced standing at all at first. We admit him on a provisional basis and see what happens. If he does good work, he may build on such courses as he has taken, that are of the ordinary academic type, and continue with us, and we may give him some credit. But it is a case of individual adjustment. There is no blanket arrangement and no understanding to that effect. The understanding is that they are not to have it, and the institution does not want them to have it. They tell them it is a different kind of thing. These semi-pro-

fessional courses lead into printing and radio work and automobile mechanics for the boys; and the girls have a nursing course (and a course for dentists' assistants has been worked out to some extent) and sewing and cooking and household economics, etc., but obviously they do not carry ordinary academic credit.

QUESTION: Have you any idea how many of those semi-professional students are going into your California colleges?

MR. MITCHELL: No, I have no idea. Mr. Showman is here. He may know.

MR. SHOWMAN: I think we have very few coming in from the semi-professional courses. The junior colleges themselves arrange for a transfer of a student from the semi-professional to the certificate course, as they call it, but there is very little direct transfer. The University of California does not take them at all.

MR. MITCHELL: That is a good point. If a person, for instance, in a semi-professional course in the first year develops the interest and the ability to go to college, part of the function of the junior college is to shift him at that time to what they call their certificate courses. The thing to look for on transcripts is the certificate course and the Junior Certificate. If a man holds a Junior Certificate with two years of satisfactory records, he is entitled to junior standing and that adjustment is usually worked out in the junior college itself.

QUESTION: Do I understand correctly that the University of California will not accept those students?

MR. SHOWMAN: No, I did not say that. It will not accept them as transfer students with the semi-professional work. The University of California is very glad to have students make up admission deficiencies in the junior college, but we do not take a semi-professional student directly with any advanced standing at all.

MISS COCKINS: Have you had any experience with students from progressive schools?

MR. SHOWMAN: Not yet. We have some coming along next fall and the year after. We have agreed to co-operate with these schools.

MISS COCKINS: Have you had any experience, Mr. Bixler, with students from the progressive schools of Chicago?

MR. BIXLER: Not yet.

MR. MITCHELL: I think the first crop comes up this year.

MR. SMITH: May I ask you, Mr. Quick, about students coming to you from the Pennsylvania Study Group? I understand they

have about seventy some students in the Pennsylvania Study Plan.

MR. QUICK: We have been requested to accept the reports made by the Study and consider the cases of the students concerned as experimental from the standpoint of admission, and we have agreed to co-operate.

MR. SMITH: Have you had many of them?

MR. QUICK: Not many. There is only one that I can call to mind at the present time.

MR. SMITH: We have had two at Michigan and there seems to be absolutely no difference between those two and the ordinary little below normal student.

MR. QUICK: That has been our experience.

MISS COCKINS: Mr. Bixler, do you wish to add anything to the discussion of yesterday morning in regard to the recruiting of students?

MR. BIXLER: I might add one or two comments. In our thinking about this question of recruiting, we should be very sure that we have our terms properly defined. We should be sure that we have the same definition of recruiting. I agree with Stradley, who thinks that recruiting is a very unfortunate term. I do not believe that any college should be denied the privilege of going out for students to some extent. It is the highly competitive type of recruiting which borders on proselyting, and sometimes is actually proselyting, that is the subject of just criticism.

Another point that I tried to make yesterday, is that this type of recruiting, which we are criticizing, is only a symptom. All of the plans that are being worked out at present, it seems to me, are merely attacking the symptom and do not get down to the fundamental causes. I refer to such remedies, for example, as the limitation of financial aid to freshmen and the plan that some institutions have adopted of requiring a student who receives a tuition scholarship, if he transfers to another institution, to pay back tuition. Not only do these plans that I have mentioned merely attack the symptom; they are, to a large extent, dangerous practices, the first, because it curbs the institution's desire to discover financial resources for students who need such assistance and, second, because it frequently interferes with students' change of educational ideals. There is no reason that I can see why a student should not transfer from one institution to another for a good educational reason.

I am in sympathy with the Ohio Plan as far as it goes, but I

think it does not go far enough. It is a good sedative, it seems to me, but it will not solve the recruiting problem, because it will not reduce the number of colleges or increase the number of prospective students for those colleges, which seems to me to be the fundamental difficulty.

MR. WEST: We can all agree on the definition of proselyting, can we not? It is proselyting if the other institution does it.

MISS COCKINS: This individualizing of instruction, or the student's curriculum, has led to a new alignment of departments in many of the colleges and universities. The divisional organization has come into being as opposed to the departmental organization. Mr. Quick, can you tell us something about the divisional plan?

MR. QUICK: Madame Chairman, following very closely the instructions given during the dress rehearsal, I have the privilege of referring to my notes. Before presenting this topic, I think I should call to your attention the fact that an authority in this new move in education sits to my right here in the person of Mr. Roy W. Bixler from the University of Chicago. The notes that I have jotted down here are based only upon what I have read. It quite frequently happens that those who criticize and write about a plan seem to know more about the plan than those who actually have it in practice. If there are any too great discrepancies, Mr. Bixler, I trust that you will correct me.

DIVISIONAL ORGANIZATION VS. DEPARTMENTAL ORGANIZATION

1. The recent interest in the divisional plan appears to have been to a large extent the result of its adoption by the University of Chicago, and it is in books and articles treating of the Chicago plan that the case for the divisional set-up is mainly set forth.

2. The fundamental argument for a divisional set-up is the avoidance of the dangers which spring from such a *high degree of specialization as appears to be the almost inevitable consequence of rigorous departmental autonomy*.

3. Departmentalization and the proliferation of highly specialized courses within each department have been natural consequences of the division of labor in scholarship which has taken place in recent decades. However valuable the results may have been from the point of view of research, it seems clear that they have tended to dehumanize liberal education.

4. Orientation courses, comprehensive examinations, divisional organizations and other similar developments have been indications of an effort to rehumanize education. (In this connection, read James Harvey Robinson's little book, *The Humanizing of Education*.)

5. The divisional type of organization is alleged to result in a more efficient allocation of administrative functions. Divisional heads are able to take over and combine certain of the tasks formerly assigned to department chairmen such as responsibility for preparation of a budget, leadership in determination of curriculum offerings of the division and, to some extent, leadership in the selection and recommendation for appointment of new members of the divisional teaching staff. This may have the advantage of relieving department chairmen, who are frequently outstanding scholars, of detailed administrative duties.

6. It is argued that a divisional chairman is better able to develop a sound budget than either department heads or—at least in an institution of any considerable size—the dean. Representing the division as a whole rather than any single department, he is able to place a check on any petty jealousies or invidious emulations which may animate individual departments. At the same time he is close enough to the problems of the departments within his division to deal with them more understandingly than a remoter administrative official such as a dean would be able to do.

7. It is alleged that divisional organization has made it possible for the total number of courses offered in an institution to be reduced without any cost to the quality of the curriculum as a whole. This is done through the checking of overlapping. For example, a midwestern university was recently able to reduce the number of courses in elementary statistics from 9 to 3 without weakening the educational opportunities in the slightest. The instructional time which was thus released became available for offering new courses and thus the curriculum was enriched.

8. The divisional organization is particularly fitted to the presentation of survey courses such as have been instituted, in the past 10 or 15 years, in so many leading colleges.

9. In recent years there has been a distinct tendency to look askance at sharp distinctions between various fields of learning. Much of the most productive recent research has been on broader lines as, for example, those represented by bio-physics and social psychology. The divisional type of organization is, it is contended,

calculated to encourage the cutting across of departmental lines both in research and in teaching. (Compare in this connection President Conant's "Roving Professorships.")

10. Probably the strongest argument for divisional organization is that it tends to bring about an integration both of the curriculum and of the programs of students. Thus this type of organization seems to conform nicely to present trends in educational method and practice. The divisional organization makes it possible for a student to concentrate in a division rather than in a department, organizing his program around a major interest. This appears to result in a much more meaningful educational experience for the student than when courses in "major and minor" departments are merely somewhat mechanically combined.

11. President Hutchins said the following concerning divisional organization:

- (a) The divisions are homogeneous enough to talk each other's language and small enough for adequate discussion of common problems.
- (b) Such organization should stimulate co-operative research.
- (c) Such organization should eliminate wasteful duplication of courses.
- (d) "We have the opportunity to develop educated men and women who are experts in their fields and experts in their fields who are educated men and women."

12. J. B. Speer, in his article on "The Functional Organization of the University"—*The Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. 5 (1934)—says:

One of the chief sources of difficulty is the overemphasis upon departmental organization. More than is sometimes realized, departments are the most important single influence in a college or university. It is the opinion of many college professors that departments have been directed to self-aggrandizement rather than to service. Excessive duplication of courses, refusal to send students to other departments for needed related courses, and bidding for students by lowering standards are some of the faults charged. These evil effects are recognized everywhere, but little is done to remedy them.¹

MR. SMITH: Mr. Quick, do you have any departmental jealousies carrying over from the department into the division?

MR. QUICK: Are you asking me for a statement based upon our experience at the University of Pittsburgh?

¹ *New York Times*, December 25, 1932, Sec. VIII, p. 5.

MR. SMITH: Yes.

MR. QUICK: Our experience is quite limited. We have had only one unit in divisional organization and that is in the Classics, representing the merger of the old Greek and Latin Departments. We contemplate a further application of the divisional policy in the near future.

MISS COCKINS: Mr. Bixler, can you answer Mr. Smith's question?

MR. BIXLER: Yes, to some extent, but it has not caused us any trouble.

MR. SMITH: They are willing to co-operate to the extent of even giving up all their fellowship holders to the division rather than holding them in the department?

MR. BIXLER: Yes. We have a central committee on fellowships and scholarships for all of the divisions and schools in the University.

MR. SAGE: Do you still have department heads or just the chairmen of divisions?

MR. BIXLER: We have one or two department heads that are hold-overs. All of the others are chairmen except in two cases. One department is presided over by a secretary and another, by an executive secretary.

MR. SAGE: Are they elected by the department or appointed by the President?

MR. BIXLER: They are appointed by the President.

MR. WEST: Is your division organized both from the administrative and from the teaching standpoint?

MR. BIXLER: Yes. One thing that is happening at Chicago is the development of instructional committees that cut across departments and, in some cases, across divisions. For example, we have a Committee on International Relations which is responsible for the organization of the curriculum in International Relations. That committee acts as a department and recommends degrees. The courses in the curriculum are chosen from wherever they happen to be in the curriculum, from all divisions if necessary. It is under the divisional budget.

MR. QUICK: How does this type of organization affect the financial problem at the University of Chicago?

MR. BIXLER: I can quote President Hutchins on that point. He said in his book, *No Friendly Voice*, which was published recently, that the divisional organization had helped the University of

Chicago to come through the depression, because power was given to the divisional deans to reduce budgets and they were more successful in doing it without interfering with the program of the University than if there had been 72 independent budgets instead of 12, as there are now.

MISS COCKINS: Mr. Tuttle, did you not say you were discussing this organization at the University of Illinois?

MR. TUTTLE: Well, I am a little inclined to think we have the cart before the horse on the matter. That is to say, without as yet reorganizing our curriculum, we have established within the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences a Division of Biological Sciences and a Division of Social Sciences. The Chairman of the Committee on the Division of Social Sciences told me the other day that the Committee, as yet, has found nothing to do. It seems to me, if there is to be a divisional reorganization, that there must also be a complete reorganization of the curriculum. I think we shall gradually work into that through the Committee, but I think the process will probably be altogether too slow.

MISS COCKINS: What is your method of approving and dropping courses at the University of Illinois?

MR. TUTTLE: That is entirely a matter for the Dean of the College and the Head of the Department.

MISS COCKINS: Do you have any central committee that approves new courses?

MR. TUTTLE: Through the college offices only.

MISS COCKINS: You have no standing faculty committee?

MR. TUTTLE: No.

MISS COCKINS: Is there a great deal of duplication of courses?

MR. TUTTLE: We are about to make a study of that. We are about to superimpose upon the present organization a centralized plan for a complete review of all courses at present offered, for the very reason that there is serious duplication. I think, Miss Cockins, that it is my prerogative to ask you if you would be willing to explain in a few words what you have done at Ohio State with reference to this matter.

MISS COCKINS: We have at the Ohio State University what we call the Council on Instruction. Any department that desires to present a new course presents it to the college in which that department is budgeted, and from the college all new courses are sent to the General Faculty Council on Instruction. This council is com-

posed of about a dozen members, with the Assistant to the President as Chairman. The Assistant to the President also is what I suppose would be known in the state organization as the Budget Commissioner. He, with the President, determines whether these new courses can be given, if they demand new instruction and, therefore, additional funds. The Council on Instruction determines whether they are duplications of courses that are already offered anywhere in the university, and whether courses that are now being offered have sufficient elections over a period of years to warrant their being left in the College announcements. That Council on Instruction has a great deal of authority, as you can see, because they approve all new curricula, new courses, new colleges, new schools, expansion in every direction; and yet they must see to it, before they recommend to the President and the Board of Trustees for additional funds for any department, that the things that are being offered, or are being asked for are not duplications of what is already being done in any department.

We do not have the divisional plan but there are many advantages to the divisional plan, particularly where the instruction is individualized, as it is in many of the institutions that are using the advisory system and relieving students from following a set curriculum of any kind and permitting them to follow their own bent as rapidly or as slowly as they care to.

Have I answered your question?

MR. TUTTLE: Yes, except that I have understood that when that Committee finished its first big job, you reduced your courses by between 300 and 400.

MISS COCKINS: Over 400. A short time ago, when the University budget began to feel the pruning knife, the President felt that it was time for the University to make its own survey and the Committee made a very careful study of all the offerings in the University. We are on the quarter plan. Many courses that had been offered two and three times a year are now offered only once because the enrolment did not warrant their being offered more than once. Some courses are offered every other year. There were over 400 courses dropped that had been carried in the catalogues for years—courses in some special field, the demand for which did not warrant the money that was being spent on them.

Is there anything else, Mr. Tuttle?

MR. SMITH: Was there any demand on the part of the students that those courses be re-established?

MISS COCKINS: No, there has not been. There has been a demand from the students for having a number of courses repeated throughout the year but that, of course, is controlled entirely by the enrolment in the course and, if the demand is sufficient, the Department always makes that fact known to the Assistant to the President, who then takes it up with the Council on Instruction.

MR. QUICK: Miss Cockins, when those courses were eliminated, did it result in a reduction of the staff of the University?

MISS COCKINS: Yes, with the appropriations cut, it was necessary to reduce the staff.

Under Item II we have something about the Professional Work of the Registrar and Especially the Assembling and Interpretation of Data for Informational Purposes. We have with us this afternoon the Comptroller of the University of Michigan. He and Mr. Smith have worked for a good many years, and the plan that they use in formulating information for the public is something that we shall all be interested in hearing. I am going to ask Mr. Christensen if he will tell us something about the Michigan plan.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Madam Chairman, I am sorry to say that we do not have any procedure at the University of Michigan which could be designated as the "Michigan plan" for the collection and transmission of statistics. Our Business office and our Registrar's office work in complete harmony and whenever statistics are issued, we make sure that there is agreement between these two offices. However, I believe we have at Michigan the same problem that confronts many officers in that statistics are issued without complete check with either the Business office or the Registrar's office, and it is for that reason I should like to emphasize in this discussion the need for some central agency for compiling and issuing statistical information. In this discussion I am not talking about other functions of the Registrar's office. I have special reference to this office as a central office for academic records.

I think we all know that during the past few years we have had in this country a large number of surveys and special studies of education. Elementary education has been surveyed in almost every shape and form and the same is true of secondary education; now the surveyors are busy with higher education. Too often these surveys have been handled by persons who are not familiar with the organization or records of universities and colleges and they have attempted to compile information which was not readily available, or information which could not be secured without completely re-

vamping the records of the business office and the registrar's office. And, further, conclusions have sometimes been drawn which may be not only meaningless but also misleading.

I am talking now to the registrars, and it seems to me that it would be well for you to endeavor to see that your institutions do not let somebody steal your functions. It seems to me that academic records—by that I mean records of the educational progress of students—should be compiled under the direction of the registrars and that the registrars should work in co-operation with the business office so that there may be complete harmony between the two in anything given out for public information.

A number of years ago I inspected a very elaborate system of cost analysis in which there had been meticulous calculation of the cost of educating a student in every course and curriculum offered at that institution. I do not now recall what unit was used—whether the clock hour or the credit hour—but I do recall that this office was well equipped with clerks and office furniture for doing a complete job, and I also found that the work of this office had not been reconciled completely with the business office of that institution. In this case an attempt was made to use the results of the investigation in budget-making—with unsatisfactory results. The various heads of departments had not been thinking of their departments in terms of unit cost expenditures. They knew what was needed in faculty personnel, equipment, and miscellaneous expenses to carry on the work of the department, and the attempt to foist a unit cost analysis as a basis for appropriation proved fruitless. I give this simply as an illustration of what may happen if independent statistical bureaus are set up in our institutions.

If I may be pardoned for suggesting what, it seems to me, should be centered in all of our registrars' offices, I wish to give the following: It seems to me that the registrars' offices should contain at least a record of the student's educational qualifications when he enters the institution, what progress he has made during his years of study, and what degree or record of transfer the institution gave him when he left. In some cases the registrar's office may well continue this record in the form of alumni records. In addition to the record of students, it seems to me, the registrar's office should have complete records of the work done by every faculty member—what courses he teaches, the enrolment in each, and other similar information. This information, when reconciled with the business

office records, should give to investigators a picture of what an institution is doing for the students and what it costs to give this educational service.

MISS COCKINS: Mr. Smith has a very efficient office and the reports that he has sent to all of us show that he has his finger on the pulse of the University and he knows exactly what is going on, and I am sure he walks across the hall and confers with the Business office.

MR. SMITH: I think you have said enough, Miss Cockins. As far as the enrolment statistics go, as they appear in our Bulletin, Miss Williams can tell you all about it; but as to correlating the work of the Registrar's office with the Business office, I am sure that we may be a little past the horse and buggy age but we have not yet reached the fast automobile age.

I am wondering how many institutions have supplementary offices of educational investigations? Mr. West, what do you have at Minnesota?

MR. WEST: We have lots of them, but we have what we call the Bureau of Educational Research, to which most of these special outside funds are assigned, and there are investigations going on in our office and the other offices by graduate students and departments, committees, faculty committees, departmental committees.

MR. SMITH: In other words, they gather certain facts from your office and take them to their offices for compilation and report.

MR. QUICK: Is there any institution that has a general clearing house that passes upon all statistical information issued by the university or college?

MR. TUTTLE: We do, Mr. Quick. We have what we call a Bureau of Institutional Research. Get the distinction between "educational" and "institutional." It has been in operation about two years and it works under a director and an advisory committee. The director is responsible to the President of the University and he is gathering together an immense amount of information and data relating to the University.

MR. SMITH: Are they gathering any information that is new to your business office or to your office? In other words, do they gather all of the information out of those two offices?

MR. TUTTLE: They gather the information out of those two offices, yes. They do not go into those offices, though, with their own people to gather data.

MR. QUICK: The question that I have in mind is this. Are all blanks referred to this Bureau of Institutional Research for approval before they are issued?

MR. TUTTLE: You mean statistical matters?

MR. QUICK: Questionnaires received from the outside.

MR. TUTTLE: No; that has not been centralized.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: What I had in mind in my previous statement was that these two offices should compile and issue information. I have been wondering if any of the institutions represented here have had problems, such as I have mentioned, where information is given out by departments disconnected with either the business office or the registrar's office. I have seen this done with unsatisfactory results in that erroneous information has been transmitted. It seems to me there should be some central place for centralizing questionnaires, as well as problems relating to educational investigations, and if this is done through a central information office, there should be close co-operation between this office and the business office and the registrar's office. I understood Mr. West to say that at Minnesota he furnishes all sorts of information to various investigators who are looking up academic records. In co-operating this way, a registrar's office may be of real service to the institution concerned.

It is impossible, of course, to compile in advance answers to all questions that may be propounded to the registrar. Someone may wish to investigate the comparative intelligence of freckle-faced boys and red-headed girls. This sort of information would not be anticipated, but it illustrates the type of questions that are sometimes asked. Some official or bureau will have to decide what are legitimate questions for information.

At the University of Michigan we follow the rule, which I presume all of you follow in preparing reports to the Office of Education—the Business office prepares the financial part of the report and the Registrar, that part relating to student enrolment, etc.

MISS COCKINS: It seems to me that the registrar's office and the business office must work closely together in order to give out accurate information for publication, or for comparison, anywhere.

MR. MacKINNON, I would like to ask you what you do in determining policies of expansion. What do they do at Massachusetts Institute?

MR. MACKINNON: They can be initiated by a department or by an individual and the final decision is with the President.

MISS COCKINS: You have not a committee, then, that passes on it?

MR. MACKINNON: Not on the question of policy.

MISS COCKINS: How do you adopt and drop courses?

MR. MACKINNON: That is purely a faculty matter.

MISS COCKINS: That is a faculty matter and not a departmental matter? Well, how do you know whether a lot of the work that is introduced is duplicated elsewhere?

MR. MACKINNON: That is up to a faculty committee and they approve or disapprove of it, depending upon whether or not they think it is a duplication.

MISS COCKINS: Mr. Leshar, do you have any Honors Courses down in Arizona?

MR. LESHER: Just a few, Miss Cockins. You all probably know more about honors courses than I do. It occurs to me that the term may be a little misleading or confusing, in that it makes no distinction between individual honors courses, as such, and the practice of building honors work around an entire curriculum extending over a year or two, such as the plan inaugurated at Swarthmore some years ago. I think that, irrespective of the size and location and the general character of institution, we all ought to be interested in honors work, because it affords an opportunity to encourage the excellent student in independent study—in the development of responsibility and initiative. The first question that we have to ask ourselves is how much it is going to cost. That explains why, in so many of the smaller colleges, there is a lack of honors work, particularly comprehensive honors work, and why the smaller colleges are reluctant, perhaps, to establish honors based upon comprehensives, because, for one thing, it discourages enrolment; at least, at times it does.

I am concerned, particularly for the moment, with individual honors courses. We have established a number of them, have had for many years seminars which, in a sense, are honors courses, and which can be used most effectively in encouraging outstanding students.

The honors courses, as such, that we have, include credit up to two units each semester, although no credit is awarded until the end of the year and, then, only upon completion of the work with a grade equivalent to one or two. I am not sure that I agree with that. I did not know much about it until I was coming here. Probably when I get home, I shall object to it. I am rather inclined to feel

that if an honor student establishes credit, he ought to get his credit irrespective of the grade. This idea of giving honors on the basis of ones or twos or simply "Passed with Honors" or "Passed" does not appeal to me at all as being logical or reasonable.

I want to stress again the idea that honors work as such is a splendid field for the encouragement of outstanding students and, irrespective of the size, and location, character of our colleges and universities, we all ought to be thinking about the establishment of honors work as a medium of encouraging independent study and responsibility and initiative and possibly the award of honors. So I am not so sure in my own mind that I would use honors courses as the medium of establishing the award of honors in connection with a degree.

I am a great believer in the value of grades as such. I have no hesitancy in saying that I have a lot of confidence in individual instructors in the award of grades, but it is true that many of us are establishing the award of honors in connection with the degree largely on the basis of comprehensive examinations given by individual departments. I think those comprehensive examinations should be controlled by a university committee and not by individual departments.

I think, too, if I may express a personal opinion, that we are inclined to go too far in the adoption of comprehensive examinations in connection with the award of a degree. I think that they should be used first of all—if they are used at all—in studying teaching methods and the value of courses as such. I believe that we are inclined to put too much emphasis on the possibility of the student being a poor student rather than on the possibility of the teacher being a poor teacher. I think that comprehensives could be used most effectively in determining whether or not our field of study happens to be built around the particular need of the group of students—and they can be used in altering our curricula effectively.

I believe, Miss Cockins, those few remarks sum up my impression of the rehearsal. I shall be glad to take another one later, if necessary.

MISS COCKINS: Mr. Sage, do you section your classes according to the ability of the students?

MR. SAGE: We are using the proficiency tests to a certain extent; in our work in English, we give the freshmen placement tests at the beginning, divide them into *high*, *medium*, and *low* sections and

carry them in these three groups during the first quarter. We also carry them in the same way in the second quarter unless some of them, through their superior performance, qualify for promotion from a lower to a higher section. Occasionally, somebody is also demoted to a lower group. During the Spring Quarter, we put the *medium* and the *low* students together and carry them together in sections, having only the *high* as distinguished from the *medium* and *low*.

MISS COCKINS: Do you give credit for proficiency tests?

MR. SAGE: We do not. I think that is debatable, and I think it is one of the things that should be discussed. If a student shows, through a proficiency test, that he can meet the requirements and pass an examination which is equivalent to what is required at the end of a quarter or semester, then it seems to me that he should be entitled to receive credit for the course and credit toward graduation. I think we need eventually to get away from the old idea of requiring each student to serve exactly four years in order to get his degree. Of course, some institutions are progressive enough to get away from that, but too many times we say the student must have attended high school for four years and, if he happens to have attended only three years but to have finished and received his diploma, sometimes we do not give credit because he happened to be brighter than the rest of the students. I think that is just the opposite to the policy we should be following. Of course, we find occasionally there are some students who try to avoid the hard work which might be involved in a high section by doing poorly in the placement tests or proficiency tests, so they can get into a low or a medium section and coast and get by with a comparatively small amount of work.

In some institutions they have the plan of bonuses for students who receive the higher marks. I doubt whether that should be used. In some of the institutions where they give bonuses, and give less than the normal amount of credit for a student who gets a "D," too many times the instructor will decide to give a student a "D," which will reduce his credits, instead of giving him an "E" or an "F" when he should have failed him. I think it substitutes a low passing mark and the smaller number of credits for a failing mark. That, it seems to me, should be discouraged.

MISS COCKINS: Mr. West, what do you do in this matter of overlapping of high school and college credits at Minnesota?

MR. WEST: We do not allow credit toward a degree. We offer a

great deal of elementary work, particularly in the modern languages and mathematics, but a student who has had that work in high school must take something else in place of it.

MISS COCKINS: If a student passes a proficiency test, is he given any college credit?

MR. WEST: No. He may take an examination for credit but the ordinary placement tests are not given for that purpose.

MISS COCKINS: But he can take an examination for credit for work that he did in the high school?

MR. WEST: Provided he did not use it for entrance.

MISS COCKINS: Is that true with you, Mr. Smith?

MR. SMITH: We do not.

MR. SAGE: I think Mr. Tuttle does that.

MISS COCKINS: How about that, Mr. Tuttle?

MR. TUTTLE: I suspect we give more proficiency examinations than anybody else. I do not mean by proficiency examinations placement tests, but a few years ago we set up a rather thorough-going provision for proficiency examinations and gave it considerable publicity. We now regularly offer proficiency examinations in all subjects of the first two years. We urge the better high school students to take these examinations and they are taking them to a large extent. The students who pass receive credit toward the degree.

We also give placement tests, in which case we do not give credit, but the proficiency examinations, as we call them, are the equivalent of semester examinations and do give credit.

MR. MITCHELL: You are really giving a credit for high school work, then.

MR. TUTTLE: Where it is not used for entrance. A student may enter the University with more than the minimum fifteen units of high school work and his extra units may be in a foreign language. He can submit to a proficiency examination and receive credit for this extra work in a foreign language.

MISS COCKINS: These individualized curricula have led in many cases to the student doing work in a wider field than a given course and, for example, at Harvard it has meant the organization of the tutorial system as an aid. Now, many people think of a tutor as a coach. A tutor at Harvard is not a coach. A tutor at Harvard has professorial rank. Many times he is a lecturer but this tutor must not only know what is given in the classroom but also, in addition

to that, he must have a knowledge in several fields, so that he can stimulate the student to a wider knowledge of co-ordinate fields.

Along with this tutorial system has come the reading periods. Some of the institutions that are not using the Harvard plan have adopted these reading periods. The reading periods extend from 10 days to 30 days. Most of these reading periods come just before the final examinations. This is the time that the tutor is busy and the student is reading in allied fields. The comprehensive examination covers this wide field of reading, and I am told that the results have been most satisfactory.

Another thing that has entered into this new trend of education is the housing of students. The housing problem has come to be a part of the regular educational program so that the student's every-day life is a part of his all-round development. It used to be that the institution took little care in the housing of students. Now, the big dormitories that used to accommodate 400 or 500 students are divided into small units. The newer institutions that are building new dormitories are building small units, so there can be more community life, and the individual has an opportunity to become acquainted with his fellows and to develop socially as well as intellectually. In a way these trends are not the particular business of the Registrar, yet all of them affect the Registrar's office; and so it seemed that in having this discussion of modern trends in education, it would be quite worth while to spend an hour or two discussing the new things that are going on in education, many of them still in an experimental stage but all of them well worth while.

It is now four o'clock. Before we adjourn, I want to thank the men who have so ably contributed to this panel discussion and who have helped to make this program this afternoon. They all told about the rehearsal but the rehearsal was nothing but a luncheon and they ate all the time.

The meeting is adjourned.

Section B—Colleges of Liberal Arts, Teachers Colleges, Junior
Colleges and Normal Schools

ENOCK C. DYRNESS, CHAIRMAN

CURRICULUM CHANGES AND THE REGISTRAR

CARRIE MAE PROBST

EDITOR'S NOTE:—Prepared from a stenographic report of an informal presentation.

What I have to say on this subject pertains, for the most part, to the liberal arts colleges and, more directly, to the women's colleges and will be given in a very informal way.

Until recently we would have been satisfied to say that the curriculum was a group of departments of instruction, each department offering courses which were either required or elective and which were evaluated in terms of semester credits, and that this curriculum was administered by means of more or less mechanical devices. The president of one of the women's colleges, in speaking at a recent meeting of the Association of American Colleges, defined the curriculum as including all the influences which affect the education of the student while in the institution: the influences in the student life affecting health, affecting human relations, affecting spoken English; the development of the library from a reservoir of books into an educational device. Certainly the curriculum is no longer what it used to be. The term "New Curriculum" is found in many current college catalogues. Colleges may be divided into three groups: those which have adopted a new curriculum, those which are in the process of adopting a new curriculum (and the process may be a very long one), and those which will soon be in the process.

Instead of attempting a comprehensive study of the changes that are now being made in the curriculum of the colleges, the trend in curriculum changes will be indicated by mentioning at random some of the things that are appearing in connection with curriculum studies and discussions. We hear a great deal about fitting the curriculum to the student, meeting individual needs, recognizing differences in ability, encouraging independence and initiative, self-direction, self-education, integration, freedom in election of courses, honors work, tutorial work, independent work, comprehensive examinations, general examinations, testing programs, placement tests, achievement tests, sophomore tests, the individualized curriculum. Course requirements and unit requirements are being discarded.

There are educational objectives instead of required courses with student programs planned to meet these objectives. Guidance programs and systems of advisers, or counselors, are being developed. Degrees are no longer awarded on the accumulation of points or credits. Group conferences, or independent work under guidance, take the place of formal classes. Final examinations are not given. A reading period is provided. The extreme case of the cessation of class work is found at Bennington where there is a winter field and reading period of two months. The division between the first two years and the last two years of the four-year college course is being emphasized. The executive secretary of the Association of American Colleges recently addressed a regional conference of the Association on the subject, "Is the American College Being Split Asunder?"

After three years of faculty meetings and committee meetings the new curriculum of Goucher College went into effect, September, 1934, and has now been in operation for two years. I trust you will pardon me in describing this new curriculum as an example of curriculum changes, because it is the one with which I am most familiar.

The new curriculum of Goucher College is an individualized curriculum with emphasis upon guidance administered by faculty advisers. The first two years, known as the Lower Division, are concerned with general education, and are administered through guidance officers, members of the teaching staff. The guidance officer has access to everything pertaining to the student for whom he is responsible. This includes the file of cumulative correspondence from the time the student first begins to write in regard to her application for admission, as well as her secondary school record and endorsements, the record of all tests taken at the time of admission and at the opening of the session, and all personality and academic records throughout the two years of the Lower Division. The last two years, known as the Upper Division, are concerned with the intensive work in the major subject and are under the direction of the major adviser, who is the chairman of the student's major department or a member of the instructional staff of that department. The major adviser is given a photostatic copy of the student's Lower Division record and has access to all personality records. Throughout the Upper Division he continues to keep informed as to the student's progress in all courses that she takes.

There are no required courses. Instead, there are eight objectives of general education. In the Lower Division the student is expected to make reasonable progress toward the following objectives: (1) to establish and maintain physical and mental health; (2) to comprehend and communicate ideas both in English and in foreign languages; (3) to understand the scientific method in theory and application; (4) to understand the heritage of the past in its relation to the present; (5) to establish satisfying relations with individuals and with groups; (6) to utilize resources with economic and aesthetic satisfaction; (7) to enjoy literature and the other arts; (8) to appreciate religious and philosophical values. This progress is measured by a general examination, six hours in length, on facts and principles underlying such of the eight objectives as are covered by courses; an examination in essay form, three hours in length; a written project in one field testing the student's ability to use tools in the library, six hours in length; an examination in one foreign language; subjective estimates of the student's progress toward the attainment of the eight objectives.

A student is admitted to the Upper Division on the basis of her cumulative record which is the record of the courses she has taken indicated by grades; the record in the general examination, the essay, and project, which is indicated by grades; the record of the language examination; subjective reports concerning those aspects of the eight objectives which are not dealt with in courses.

No credits, points, or credit evaluation are given to any of these criteria. Course grades are reported in the usual way at the end of each of the six terms of the Lower Division. Sophomores take no course examinations at the end of the third term of the second year. Instead, they take the general examination which is given in seven divisions and covers all objectives except the second, which is comprehension and communication of ideas in English and languages. This general examination is prepared and scored under the direction of the Examination Board. The Registrar's office prepares report sheets listing students by number only and retaining the key list of names. This report sheet calls for a grade on each of the seven objectives and a final grade on the examination as a whole, which is the grade recorded on the student's permanent record. The library project is worked out by the student in the library on assigned dates during the month of April. The Registrar's office sends to the sub-committee on the library project a report

sheet for grades, using the same numbered listing instead of the student names. The essay examination is taken during the latter part of April and similar report sheets are sent to the sub-committee on the essay. The Registrar obtains subjective reports for each sophomore on cards prepared for the purpose from the guidance officer, the Student Counselor, the head of the Health Service, the Librarian, and the Vocational Secretary, who is in touch with the financial needs and difficulties of the students. All these reports, objective and subjective, are assembled by the Registrar's office on a summary sheet on which is recorded after each sophomore's name the average of course grades for each of the two years (freshman and sophomore), the result of the language examination, the grades for the general examination, the essay examination, and library project, and an indication as to the character of the subjective reports. This summary report is presented by the Registrar to the Examination Board in mimeographed form so that each member of the Board has his own copy. The Examination Board meets one week after the close of the general examination and takes action upon the eligibility of the sophomores to pass into the Upper Division. This detailed account of procedure in regard to examinations and records at the end of the Lower Division has been given to show that at Goucher passing students from the sophomore to the junior year is no longer the simple business of adding up credits.

The requirements for graduation—the award of the A.B. degree—are (1) satisfactory comprehensive examination in the major subject, (2) record of work not included in the major that is satisfactory to the Committee on Records, (3) a record of progress toward the attainment of the eight objectives of general education, (4) residence in Goucher College during the last three terms of the college course. The major comprehensive examination is six hours in length and is given at the end of the senior year and is the only examination the senior takes at that time, unless an instructor requires a course examination on account of poor quality of work. Grades are given on the comprehensive examination. The Registrar obtains subjective reports for each senior, similar to those obtained for the sophomores at the end of the Lower Division. These are made available to the major advisers who study all records and reports for their respective majors. On the basis of this general review of all records, the major adviser recommends his students for graduation to the Committee on Candidacy for the Degree and to the Com-

mittee on Records. Formerly the Registrar checked the record of each senior as to the courses and number of hours required for her major subject and for the one hundred and twenty semester units required for graduation, and merely reported to the Committee for action those who were satisfactory or who were deficient.

With the adoption of the new curriculum, other changes were made in procedures at Goucher College. The school year was changed from two semesters to three terms. Although a three-term calendar for the year, with all the necessary time appointments for the year, had been worked out when the new curriculum was first adopted, now, after the experience of these two years, the Faculty has just adopted a revised calendar which seems to give a more equal division of time for each term and fixes more satisfactory dates for examinations at the end of each term.

Now the student takes three courses each term instead of the five courses which were formerly carried each semester. In the Upper Division qualified students may take only two courses and do independent work in place of the third. Such independent work on one project, carried for at least two terms with distinction, may entitle the student to graduate with special honors. In place of a term course in the major subject, a senior may do integration work preparing privately, or with a group, for the comprehensive examination.

Formerly the courses were on the basis of three hours a week. Now all courses are meeting four hours a week, Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, and Friday. Wednesday has been reserved for work that calls for consecutive time. This may be formal laboratory assignments, independent or group work, field trips, visits to outside laboratories, to galleries in Baltimore and Washington or even to the planetarium in Philadelphia.

From your own experiences and with the aid of your imagination, you can realize what the new curriculum at Goucher has meant to the Registrar and the Registrar's office. One of the first and largest pieces of work was the revision of the catalogue. As editor of college publications, the Registrar was responsible for assembling and editing all the material for an entirely new catalogue. All record forms had to be changed, and as a new type of permanent record form had been needed for some time, an entirely new system of keeping permanent records was adopted. The mere fact of having three terms instead of two semesters necessitated change in all office forms

and procedure. Everything that had been done twice a year in the way of registration, final examinations, and reports, now, has to be done three times a year. In adjusting the Registrar's office to the new curriculum, we have had to go step by step, planning in advance whenever possible, and meeting situations as well as we could when they arose. There has been a constant challenge to foresee what would happen, and to have a plan before some member of the faculty or some chairman of a committee would ask how it was to be done, or even present a plan of his own. Situations came upon one before one realized that they existed. The experience growing out of a new curriculum is one of the best disciplines for developing all the known virtues, especially patience. We hear much in connection with this modern educational trend in regard to adapting the program to the needs of the students and making programs more flexible, but from the Registrar's standpoint it is a question of adapting the Registrar to the program and keeping the Registrar flexible. The quotation from James Russell Lowell with which our President opened our sessions seems so applicable to this topic that I shall quote it, with apologies for making just one change:

New occasions teach new duties;
 Time makes ancient good uncouth;
 They must upward still and onward
 Who would keep abreast of—the new curriculum.

SUMMARY

ENOCK C. DYRNESS

The Section B meeting proved to be one of the most interesting and stimulating sessions of the convention. The attendance was unusually large, and considerable interest was displayed in each topic presented. Mr. Harry Elder, Registrar of Indiana State Teachers College, opened the discussion with his paper "Scholastic and Personality Data of Freshmen" which is printed in full elsewhere in this issue. Much helpful discussion followed Mr. Elder's presentation, and it was quite apparent that registrars generally are taking an active part in the personnel guidance program of their institutions. The modern registrar not only furnishes the various officers and teachers with information concerning a student's scholastic record and mere statistical data, but acquaints faculty and advisers with information concerning personnel problems and difficulties which make possible remedial treatment before students have

failed. It is apparent that educational guidance can be effectually administered only when the personal problems of the students are considered and understood.

Miss Kathleen Alsop, of the College of William and Mary, presented the topic "Student Reports—Their Purpose and Frequency." She outlined briefly the problem which her office faces in attempting to get out four sets of reports to students each year. The practice of having monthly reports was discontinued in favor of the mid-semester reports. In the discussion which followed, it was apparent that the general tendency is to reduce the number of reports sent out to students. A large number of institutions still retain the six-weeks report, although most institutions seem to favor the mid-semester report where any report is sent out to students during the semester. The general tendency, however, seems to be to have more frequent reports on failing students and fewer reports of the routine type, which simply call for the assignment of grades to all students during the semester. Although most registrars still are concerned about compiling failure lists during the semester, a large number are gradually eliminating much of the clerical work involved in tabulating and reporting grades during the course of the term. Mr. Steimle, of Michigan State Normal School, cited an interesting experience which they had had in eliminating the mid-term delinquency report about ten years ago. Now the dean is notified immediately when a student is absent excessively or is doing unsatisfactory work. Such reports are sent in promptly and frequently lead to remedial measures before the student actually fails. Dr. Serenius, of Augustana College, mentioned a similar plan which also includes special reports on students doing exceptionally well. This gives the dean an opportunity to encourage the brighter students as well as to help those who are failing.

Miss Carrie Mae Probst, Registrar of Goucher College, presented her paper "Curriculum Changes and the Registrar" which is found elsewhere in this issue. This paper, together with Mr. Ernest Miller's presentation of "The Changing Registrar's Office" at the University of Chicago, provoked considerable discussion. Mr. Miller pointed out that the registrar, under the new plan, is still responsible for the central registration procedure and still maintains certain essential records, although credits and grades as such are no longer of any significance. His office, as well as that of Miss Probst, has reached the Utopian stage of not having to wrestle with

hours, grade points, or averages! At the University of Chicago the Registrar is responsible for the conducting of the general or comprehensive examination, and during the past four years has conducted over fifty thousand individual general examinations, not including a multitude of freshman tests. The new plan has served to elevate the position of Registrar rather than to destroy it, as has been supposed might be the case, and a larger staff of workers is required to carry on the work of the Registrar's office than under the old credit system.

A question was raised as to whether the teaching certificate requirements of state departments of education could be met where no credits were assigned. It seems that no difficulty of this kind has been experienced because of the new plan. It is still possible to report on specific courses and the time devoted to each, although semester hours of credit as such are not given. Since no professional training is included in the Goucher program, students must take their practice teaching outside of their regular program, and frequently in institutions outside the state. Students from nearby states are encouraged to devote their summers to professional study in their respective states in preparation for high school teaching in their home community. If we are to judge from the response of the students themselves, it seems that they favor the change which has been made at Chicago and other institutions, including Goucher, which have adopted similar plans. Registrars generally seem to be resigned to the fact that the credit system is on its way out, and strange to say, no voice was raised in its defense. Although the credit system apparently is not here to stay, it is quite obvious that the position of registrar will remain, at least for some years to come.

Open Forum

SUMMARY

K. P. R. NEVILLE, CHAIRMAN

Is a publicly supported institution of higher learning justified in discouraging the admission of applicants who rank low in their high school graduating classes? If so, how can this be managed?

MR. HOWELL (Texas A. and M. College): For a good many years we have been concerned with a large number of low-ranking high school graduates who come to us, a state institution, where we have no legal way of denying admission to any high school graduate from an accredited high school. We thought at one time that we could write a letter to the parents of each boy applying for admission and advise against such admission on account of the low grades made in the preparatory school. We got together what we thought was an excellent letter and we started sending it out to the parent or guardian of each student applying for admission who ranked in the lowest quarter of his graduating class. We continued the practice for a few years but have discontinued it, because the letter seemed to be an encouragement rather than a discouragement to the low-ranking graduates who applied for admission. They were bound to come to college and show us that they could make good. Most of them did not.

MR. SAGE (University of Iowa): We have a similar plan. We found that about ten per cent of those who received the discouraging communication did not come, so we feel it is effective in deterring some from actually entering.

MR. WEST (University of Minnesota): I think the method of approach is all wrong. You should not discourage these men. You should tell them what fine chaps they are, but that they would be better off in some other field, and point out to them what the field is. If you have any basis or means of analysing their situations you can be of some positive assistance to them, and not merely a cause of discouragement.

MRS. LEHN (Hunter College): We have a larger registration than we can possibly accommodate, so we omit the lowest ten per cent of the applicants.

How can we detect all the culprits who are admitted from high schools and, in spite of protestations to the contrary, are found to have attended another college which they left "for reasons"?

MR. BIXLER (University of Chicago): The answer is very brief. We cannot. I can only tell you what we do at Chicago. We ask the applicant to fill in a chronological history of his school attendance and his work experience. If there are gaps the office sees that they are filled in. We ask this question: "Have you ever been dismissed from, or placed on probation in any college?" At the end of his part of the application we ask him to sign the following statement: "I certify that the above information is accurate and complete." At this point he turns his application over to the principal of his high school. The principal has four pages to fill out and has to state whether, in his judgment, the statements made by the student are substantially correct. The principal will probably detect it if the applicant has been to college and will report the fact to us.

MR. HALE (Birmingham-Southern College): For the last several years, when we have received our statements from the high schools, if they showed dates of graduation prior to the term in which the students were entering, we have sent out a short form to the principal asking him whether he has sent the students' credentials to any other institution, and if so, which. If he knows whether the student has been at any other institution, we have been able to trace things down in that way.

MR. SMYSER (Miami University): I would like to know what happens to the student detected. In spite of all the care we take, about once a year we find such a student. Hitherto, our Admissions Committee has always revoked his admission and required him to leave, regardless of the record he has made with us. Some of our Faculty feel that this is too harsh.

MR. BIXLER (Chicago): We have no rule. We may revoke the certificate of admission, or we may merely reprimand the student and let it go at that. It depends on the merit of the case.

MR. WEST (Minnesota): We would drop the student at Minnesota if we found him out, but we feel that our responsibility ends when we have asked the question, "Have you been to another institution or not?" and he says, "No." I cannot see that it is a very serious matter if one or two do "get by."

MR. STONE (Purdue University): The cases we have had this year have been cases where the student owes money at another

institution and cannot get a transcript. We have settled those cases by suspending the student until he could square things with the other institution. When that has been done, we let him come back.

MR. BUTTERFIELD (Bay City): I am wondering if the registrar of the college the student has attended has any responsibility in the matter, if he hears that the student has entered some other institution as a freshman as though he were from high school.

MR. WILSON (North Carolina): We have had one or two cases of that sort where the other institution volunteered information; as soon as they found out that the student was attending our institution they sent us word, calling attention to the fact that the student had been at their institution and for some reason or other could not get a transcript.

Have there been any recent tendencies towards liberalization of admission requirements?

MR. KERR (University of Arkansas): I am not familiar with any investigations that have been made in the matter of liberalizing entrance requirements, but I feel that there is not much correlation between success in college and the high school pattern. I have a feeling that those of us who have not liberalized our requirements in the way of specific subjects at least ought to be considering it seriously. I do not think there is a very great carry-over, but some institutions, by reason of the type of work that they offer, are justified in insisting on certain high school prerequisites. I suppose an engineering school must require mathematics. Otherwise, students who want to take engineering would have to start back at such an elementary stage of mathematics that their whole college curriculum would be either slowed up or halted. Outside of a few specific subjects which must be carried on in this way, it seems to me there is very little to be said for requiring specific subjects for college admission.

MR. MITCHELL (Stanford University): We have tried to find out whether or not such correlation existed. We have taken the upper, middle, and lower thirds in scholarship in college and tried to go back to high school to see if the high school pattern furnished any cause for relative standing in college. We have not been able to get rhyme or reason out of it so far. Before we can say there is no clear-cut relationship, we must investigate a much larger group than we have had the opportunity to examine so far, but as far as I know, whenever anybody has tried to find a correlation between pattern of high school work and success in college he has failed.

MR. SHOWMAN (University of California): We have agreed to accept students from a limited number of high schools without regard to performance in the high school, but directly on the recommendation of the principal.

MR. SOUTHWICK (College of Wooster): It so happens that I made a check-up of about 25 privately-endowed institutions scattered all over the country and I found that there was a trend toward less emphasis upon the pattern and greater emphasis upon the scholastic rating and other evidences of intellectual ability. May I call attention to the report of Dr. Wilford Aiken with reference to the response he has received from some 250 colleges promising participation in the Progressive Education Experiment. A large majority of these 250 colleges promised to carry on the experiment of the selected students without reservation, that is, to admit them without reference to pattern requirements before they entered the institution.

MR. NELSON (University of Denver): We have attempted to meet this problem in our College of Liberal Arts in this way. We have built our junior college requirements on the idea of articulation between high school and college, so as to bring the student out at the conclusion of the junior college period at a point where he has something of a liberal education. We have asked that he complete by a combination of high school and college work a definite program so that when he gets through he will have some adequate training in English, in foreign languages, in social sciences, in physical science and mathematics, in biological science, and in the general cultural group, philosophy, religion, etc.

MR. LESHER (University of Arizona): I would like to ask Mr. Mitchell a question. In connection with his rather unique requirement for admission, namely only two units of English, I would like to ask whether in his experience he has found that there is much divergence from a fairly well-rounded high school program?

MR. MITCHELL: Nearly every high school graduate has come in with a well-distributed high school pattern, including even three or four, rather than two, units of English. Like Denver, we build the work in the first two years on the previous pattern. We feel that to refuse a man admission to college because he has not had a foreign language, or mathematics, or something, is an absurdity, but to let him come in and learn it after he gets in is a perfectly sound policy, if he is originally selected on the basis of ability.

What machines can be used for various duties in the registrar's office?

MR. GLADFELTER (Temple University): In the last two years in

connection with advertising copy for the *Bulletin*, we have sent out questionnaires in an endeavor to get information about the requirements and the interests of the registrars. The questions most commonly raised concerned methods of the duplication of records. Mr. Cornwall, who has followed the registrars' conventions for some years as the representative of Remington-Rand, has agreed to make some remarks on general principles of duplication and duplicating machines, and not a sales talk.

MR. CORNWALL: In the report made by Mr. Smith to the 1934 Convention, published in the *Bulletin*, a complete discussion of various methods was set forth. A review of these pages I would recommend to all. Assuming that I were in a position where I had to select some method of duplication, I would say that there are certain features I would consider very important. First, is accuracy. The photographic method offers the only means of assuring accuracy. The camera never lies. Second, the type of machine must be such as to reproduce student records of all kinds, because in many universities the records have been copied over a period of years and may not be uniform at all. You want something that can handle past records, present records, and any possible future records. Third, you want something simple, so that student help can operate the equipment. Fourth, you want something inexpensive. Inexpensive means, however, not a low cost of original equipment, but a low cost per transcript or per print. Fifth, you want something fast, so that it can not only do the work of the registrar's office but also of several other parallel offices.

If your contemplated purchase can measure up to all of these items on the score sheet that you should prepare for yourself, your particular investment is going to be wise and satisfactory.

MR. TUTTLE (University of Illinois): We have just installed a Dexigraph machine. The installation included the rental of the camera, which can not be purchased, the purchase of an electric drier, the building and equipping of a dark room. We were able to speed up our work so that we duplicated 3,632 records of the College of Liberal Arts between two o'clock Friday afternoon and eleven o'clock Friday night. We used two students on the camera, two students in the dark room, one student washing and drying—a total of five. We found that the girl operating the camera could snap twelve pictures a minute; also, that the people in the dark room could have handled the output of two cameras instead of one. In other

words, with another camera we could have done the job for practically all the colleges on the campus in that same time.

MISS GEORGE (Northwestern University): May I ask whether the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts at Illinois was satisfied with the record of white on black and the reduced size of the record?

MR. SEYLER (Illinois): The Dean was quite satisfied with the records. As for size, we have an 8"×10" record typewritten. The only things recorded in ink are the grades. The typewritten record, 8"×10", reduces in the picture to 5.6"×7" on a 6"×8" paper, which allows an inch at the bottom of the picture for the explanation of the grading system. The size seemed quite satisfactory to the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts.

MR. GRANT (Columbia University): We have used the black and white machine for four or five years and have found it very satisfactory, no dark room, no drying necessary. We invested in two machines, the blueprint are light machine and the developer. The developer dries as it develops. We are able to reproduce 6,000 copies a day, exact facsimiles in black and white.

MR. HOLTER (Bucknell University): We use a Dexigraph. We have added to our registration card an identification photograph. We make copies for anybody who wants the record, with a photograph attached.

MR. QUICK (University of Pittsburgh): We have a happy experience with blueprinting. I think we can rival the speed of the University of Illinois just reported. The advantages as we see them are: (1) it is a paper master sheet—the thinness makes it easy to bind—and thus many records can be kept in a very small space; (2) we can use the method for reproducing personal history data that we receive on the application blank. If the student is admitted, we so advise him. When that is done, we start the process of transcribing the information from the application form onto another master sheet. The blueprints from the master sheets are sent to the deans of the various schools who, therefore, find it possible to write personal letters to those who have been admitted. They have a line on their incoming class before they ever meet the students on the campus.

MR. MITCHELL (Stanford): I would like to make a suggestion that has not been brought out at all. We are interested in getting a print that does not curl. We want to fold our prints to be mailed to the students. If they curl, they clog the folding machine and it does not work.

MR. GRANT (Columbia): There is an improved machine that heats both surfaces at the same time and there is practically no curling at all.

MR. CORNWALL: The curling of the print can be almost entirely eliminated by proper drying. The speed at which the prints are dried and the heat with which they are dried has a great deal to do with the result. We have found that by regulating the heat and the speed so that the prints go through a little slower and dry more fully, we secure a minimum of curling. Of course, any sensitized paper that is sensitized on one side with an emulsion, and not on the other, has a tendency to curl but if we add another step to the process, putting the prints in a solution of glycerine and water before they are put into the drier, they come through beautifully and perfectly flat.

An Analysis of Enrolments and Degrees Conferred Over a Six-Year Period¹

FRED L. KERR

This paper is an extension of last year's study, and includes in addition an analysis of at least part of the data into geographical divisions. The distribution of institutions entering into the compilations is shown at the bottom of Table IV. The number of institutions entering into some of the groupings is too small to indicate general trends accurately, but certainly there are enough of all types of institutions in each geographical division and enough of each type of institution in all divisions to give reliable indications.

Table I shows the total enrolments by men and women, and total for each year from 1929 to 1935, and the percentage gain or loss from year to year and over the six-year period, in each type of institution. The totals of degrees conferred are also included in this table. As noted in the previous study, increases were practically uniform in 1930-31 over 1929-30. The following year, increases continued in a number of the groupings, but there began to be decreases particularly among the professional schools and among the women in other types of institutions. In 1932-33 decreases were the rule in all groupings except the men in junior and teachers colleges, and in 1933-34 decreases continued in all groupings (with one exception). In 1934-35 there was a decided upturn in enrolments in all groupings without exception. The net total change over the six-year period was positive for the men in all types of institution except professional schools, and was negative for women in all types except junior colleges. In the total degrees conferred the increases were more persistent than in enrolments, and the decreases, where they did occur, were smaller. Note that in 1932-33 in the universities, arts colleges, professional schools, and total group there were continued increases in degrees conferred, although enrolments decreased in these groups for the same year. In the following year degrees conferred decreased, except in professional schools, and in 1934-35 they increased coincident with the increase in enrolments, except in professional schools, again, and in universities where the decrease is very slight.

¹ Research paper No. 435, Journal Series, University of Arkansas.

In comparing this table with the one prepared last year, it is interesting to note that whereas in the universities there was a net decrease in men and in total enrolment over the five-year period from 1929 to 1934, there is an increase over the six-year period.

TABLE I
TOTAL ENROLMENTS AND DEGREES CONFERRED

TYPE OF INSTITUTION	YEAR	ENROLMENTS					DEGREES	
		MEN	PER CENT GAIN OR LOSS	WOMEN	PER CENT GAIN OR LOSS	TOTAL	PER CENT GAIN OR LOSS	NUMBER
Universities	1929-30	219,954		114,061		334,015		48,821
	1930-31	227,623	+ 3.49	114,653	+ 0.52	342,276	+ 2.47	51,582
	1931-32	228,997	+ 0.60	113,936	- 0.63	342,933	+ 0.19	54,851
	1932-33	217,758	- 4.91	107,032	- 6.06	324,790	- 5.29	54,651
	1933-34	211,991	- 2.65	103,485	- 3.31	315,476	- 2.87	52,028
	1934-35	228,704	+ 7.88	108,473	+ 4.82	337,177	+ 6.88	51,602
	6 Yr. Pd.		+ 3.98		- 4.90		+ 0.95	+ 5.70
Liberal Arts Colleges	1929-30	35,723		58,567		94,290		13,822
	1930-31	37,050	+ 3.71	57,804	- 1.30	94,854	+ 0.60	14,360
	1931-32	37,612	+ 1.52	56,421	- 2.39	94,033	- 0.87	14,843
	1932-33	36,671	- 2.50	55,878	- 0.96	92,549	- 1.58	14,042
	1933-34	36,108	- 1.54	55,156	- 1.29	91,264	- 1.39	13,899
	1934-35	36,941	+ 2.31	57,578	+ 4.39	94,519	+ 3.57	14,230
	6 Yr. Pd.		+ 3.41		- 1.69		+ 0.24	+ 2.95
Junior Colleges	1929-30	2,891		3,138		6,029		
	1930-31	3,285	+13.63	3,303	+ 5.26	6,588	+ 9.27	
	1931-32	2,851	-13.21	3,508	+ 6.21	6,359	- 3.48	
	1932-33	4,059	+42.37	3,367	- 4.02	7,426	+16.78	
	1933-34	3,776	- 6.97	3,369	+ 0.06	7,145	- 3.78	
	1934-35	4,027	+ 6.65	3,477	+ 3.21	7,504	+ 5.02	
	6 Yr. Pd.		+39.29		+10.80		+24.47	
Teachers Colleges	1929-30	9,196		23,846		33,042		2,914
	1930-31	10,191	+10.82	24,177	+ 1.39	34,368	+ 4.01	3,406
	1931-32	11,903	+16.80	22,647	- 6.33	34,550	+ 0.53	3,754
	1932-33	11,942	+ 0.33	21,546	- 4.86	33,488	- 3.07	3,970
	1933-34	10,329	-13.51	18,823	-12.64	29,152	-12.95	3,765
	1934-35	11,267	+ 9.08	19,174	+ 1.86	30,441	+ 4.42	3,948
	6 Yr. Pd.		+22.52		-19.59		- 7.87	+35.48
Professional and Technical Schools	1929-30	22,925		5,441		28,366		3,739
	1930-31	24,074	+ 5.01	5,503	+ 1.14	29,577	+ 4.27	3,908
	1931-32	23,473	- 2.50	5,238	- 4.82	28,711	- 2.93	4,189
	1932-33	21,718	- 7.48	5,075	- 3.11	26,793	- 6.68	4,114
	1933-34	20,122	- 7.35	4,910	- 3.25	25,032	- 6.57	4,256
	1934-35	21,093	+ 4.83	5,356	+ 9.08	26,449	+ 5.86	3,941
	6 Yr. Pd.		- 7.99		- 1.56		- 6.76	+ 5.40
TOTAL	1929-30	290,689		205,053		495,742		69,296
	1930-31	302,223	+ 3.97	205,440	+ 0.19	507,663	+ 2.40	73,256
	1931-32	304,836	+ 0.86	201,750	- 1.80	506,586	- 0.21	77,637
	1932-33	292,148	- 4.16	192,898	- 4.39	485,046	- 4.25	76,777
	1933-34	282,326	- 3.36	185,743	- 3.71	468,069	- 3.50	73,948
	1934-35	302,032	+ 6.98	194,058	+ 4.48	496,090	+ 5.99	73,721
	6 Yr. Pd.		+ 3.90		- 5.36		+ 0.07	+ 6.39

Likewise, the decreases in women in these types and in nearly all groupings in teachers colleges and professional schools are smaller than over the five-year period. The junior college enrolments, though somewhat erratic on account of the small number of such institutions for which data were available, continue to increase, but

not out of proportion to the increases in other types of institutions.

In the total enrolments for all types of institutions note that there is an increase in men over the six-year period, but a decrease in women which practically neutralizes the increase in men and brings the increase in total enrolment of men and women combined down to 0.07 per cent. Notwithstanding this negligible net increase in enrolment, there was a net increase of 6.39 per cent in the number of degrees conferred over the number conferred in 1929-30. In explanation of this phenomenon I would suggest two factors, both of which, I believe, are operative: first, that the students who have been able to remain in school during these years of economic stress are somewhat more serious minded and more successful in carrying their work through to completion; and second, that the total enrolment, which is nearly stationary over the six-year period, probably represents an increase in upper class and graduate students with a smaller increase, or perhaps a decrease, in lower class students. (See Table V for graduate enrolments).

Table II presents data corresponding to that of Table I grouped according to geographical divisions as indicated in the table. The most interesting feature of this table is that the net total increases of men shown in all types of institutions except professional schools have turned to decreases in the North Atlantic and North Central divisions. The net total decreases in women have turned to very small increases in the South Central and Western divisions, while the increases in men in these divisions have become quite sizable. In spite of the net total enrolment decrease in the North Atlantic states, however, there was a net increase in the degrees as large as that of the total of all institutions shown in Table I. The North Central division is the only one in which there was a net decrease in degrees, but the decrease is very small. The percentages of increase or decrease from year to year in the several divisions are similar to those shown for the various types of institutions in Table I and perhaps need little further comment. In all divisions there were increases of both men and women in 1934-35 over the previous year, albeit the increases were considerably larger in the South Central and Western sections than in the others.

Table III is an extensive and rather complicated compilation showing the percentage increase or decrease in enrolments from year to year and over the six-year period in each type of institution in each of the geographical divisions. The actual enrolment figures

could not be included without making too bulky and unwieldy a table to be conveniently reproduced. As I indicated at the beginning

TABLE II
TOTAL ENROLMENTS AND DEGREES CONFERRED
ARRANGED BY GEOGRAPHICAL DIVISIONS

GEO- GRAPHICAL DIVISION	YEAR	ENROLMENTS					DEGREES		
		MEN	PER CENT GAIN OR LOSS	WOMEN	PER CENT GAIN OR LOSS	TOTAL	PER CENT GAIN OR LOSS	NUM- BER	PER CENT GAIN OR LOSS
North Atlantic States	1929-30	90,641		63,643		154,284		21,535	
	1930-31	93,268	+ 2.90	61,914	- 2.72	155,182	+ 0.58	22,673	+ 5.28
	1931-32	93,925	+ 0.71	61,336	- 0.93	155,261	+ 0.05	24,060	+ 6.12
	1932-33	90,440	- 3.71	60,098	- 2.02	150,538	- 3.04	23,884	- 0.73
	1933-34	87,186	- 3.60	57,770	- 3.87	144,956	- 3.71	23,501	- 1.60
	1934-35	87,980	+ 0.91	59,534	+ 3.05	147,514	+ 1.76	23,024	- 2.03
	6 Yr. Pd.		- 2.94		- 6.46		- 4.39		+ 6.91
South Atlantic States	1929-30	28,224		18,249		46,473		6,112	
	1930-31	29,289	+ 3.77	18,306	+ 0.31	47,595	+ 2.41	6,450	+ 5.53
	1931-32	29,850	+ 1.92	18,038	- 1.16	47,888	+ 0.62	6,965	+ 7.98
	1932-33	29,190	- 2.21	17,764	- 1.52	46,954	- 1.95	6,990	+ 0.36
	1933-34	27,661	- 5.24	16,275	- 8.38	43,936	- 6.43	6,848	- 2.03
	1934-35	29,662	+ 7.23	17,115	+ 5.16	46,777	+ 6.47	6,940	+ 1.34
	6 Yr. Pd.		+ 5.09		- 6.21		+ 0.65		+13.55
North Central States	1929-30	100,639		62,239		162,878		25,898	
	1930-31	105,110	+ 4.44	63,476	+ 1.99	168,586	+ 3.50	27,454	+ 6.01
	1931-32	104,493	- 0.59	61,364	- 3.33	165,857	- 1.62	28,526	+ 3.90
	1932-33	96,510	- 7.64	56,563	- 7.82	153,073	- 7.71	27,824	- 2.46
	1933-34	92,948	- 3.69	54,987	- 2.79	147,935	- 3.36	26,217	- 5.78
	1934-35	98,568	+ 6.05	56,109	+ 2.04	154,677	+ 4.56	25,742	- 1.81
	6 Yr. Pd.		- 2.06		- 9.85		- 5.04		- 0.60
South Central States	1929-30	31,029		28,182		59,211		8,134	
	1930-31	31,859	+ 2.67	28,330	+ 0.53	60,189	+ 1.65	8,283	+ 1.83
	1931-32	32,697	+ 2.63	27,677	- 2.30	60,374	+ 0.31	9,038	+ 9.12
	1932-33	32,098	- 1.83	26,365	- 4.74	58,463	- 3.17	8,884	- 1.70
	1933-34	31,161	- 2.92	25,643	- 2.74	56,804	- 2.84	8,780	- 1.17
	1934-35	35,758	+14.75	28,437	+10.90	64,195	+13.01	9,031	+ 2.86
	6 Yr. Pd.		+15.24		+ 0.90		+ 8.42		+11.03
Western States	1929-30	40,156		32,740		72,896		7,617	
	1930-31	42,697	+ 6.33	33,414	+ 2.06	76,111	+ 4.41	8,396	+10.23
	1931-32	44,861	+ 5.07	33,335	- 0.24	78,196	+ 2.74	9,048	+ 7.77
	1932-33	43,910	- 2.12	32,108	- 3.68	76,018	- 2.79	9,195	+ 1.62
	1933-34	43,772	- 0.31	31,068	- 3.24	74,840	- 1.55	8,602	- 6.45
	1934-35	48,916	+11.75	32,757	+ 5.44	81,673	+ 9.13	8,984	+ 4.44
	6 Yr. Pd.		+21.81		+ 0.05		+12.04		+17.95
NORTH ATLANTIC		SOUTH ATLANTIC		NORTH CENTRAL		SOUTH CENTRAL		WESTERN	
Connecticut		Alabama		Illinois		Arkansas		Arizona	
Maine		Delaware		Indiana		Kansas		California	
Massachusetts		Dist. of Columbia		Iowa		Kentucky		Colorado	
New Hampshire		Florida		Michigan		Louisiana		Idaho	
New Jersey		Georgia		Minnesota		Mississippi		Montana	
New York		Maryland		Nebraska		Missouri		Nevada	
Pennsylvania		North Carolina		North Dakota		Oklahoma		New Mexico	
Rhode Island		South Carolina		Ohio		Tennessee		Oregon	
Vermont		Virginia		South Dakota		Texas		Utah	
		West Virginia		Wisconsin				Washington	
								Wyoming	

of the paper, the numbers of certain types of institutions in some of the divisions are too small to give reliable indications of general trends. I shall not make specific comments on this table. I believe

TABLE III
PERCENTAGE INCREASE OR DECREASE IN ENROLLMENTS FROM YEAR TO YEAR AND OVER THE SIX-YEAR PERIOD
BY GEOGRAPHICAL DIVISION AND BY SEX

Type of Institution	Year	North Atlantic			South Atlantic			North Central			South Central			Western			
		Men	Women	Total	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women	Total	
Universities	1930-31	+	2.51	-	2.16	+	0.91	+	4.77	+	6.75	+	5.15	+	3.25	+	2.53
	1931-32	+	0.23	-	2.37	+	0.62	+	3.21	+	6.50	+	4.02	+	1.39	+	1.40
	1932-33	-	3.69	-	7.02	-	3.74	-	3.34	-	2.15	-	3.40	-	7.77	-	8.03
	1933-34	-	3.07	-	4.88	-	3.64	-	3.48	-	9.12	-	6.40	-	3.48	-	2.77
	1934-35	+	1.60	+	2.76	+	1.96	+	7.85	+	9.24	+	8.20	+	7.43	+	6.23
	6 Years	-	2.55	-	13.16	-	6.18	-	6.11	-	10.45	-	7.16	-	2.64	-	3.77
Liberal Arts Colleges	1930-31	+	2.51	-	3.49	-	1.59	+	4.50	-	0.34	+	1.43	+	5.01	+	0.89
	1931-32	+	4.57	+	1.13	+	2.27	+	0.79	-	4.89	-	2.75	+	0.34	+	2.81
	1932-33	-	0.66	+	5.71	+	3.56	+	3.19	-	2.21	-	0.10	-	6.08	-	6.49
	1933-34	-	2.28	-	1.87	-	2.00	-	2.12	-	7.19	-	5.14	-	1.47	-	0.11
	1934-35	-	0.19	+	3.46	+	2.28	+	7.86	+	4.51	+	5.91	+	0.27	+	1.16
	6 Years	+	3.86	+	4.76	+	4.47	+	14.74	-	10.09	-	0.99	-	2.90	-	8.34
Junior Colleges	1930-31																
	1931-32																
	1932-33																
	1933-34																
	1934-35																
	6 Years																
Teachers Colleges	1930-31	+	23.18	-	9.68	-	6.45	-	1.87	-	8.26	-	6.49	-	14.08	-	8.24
	1931-32	+	53.76	-	2.80	+	9.40	+	28.07	+	8.26	+	0.85	+	13.44	+	8.55
	1932-33	+	17.13	+	0.08	+	3.18	+	22.20	+	2.39	+	7.79	+	0.34	+	7.08
	1933-34	-	1.79	-	11.90	-	9.81	-	23.50	-	10.53	-	14.12	-	14.78	-	16.79
	1934-35	-	8.51	+	2.38	+	3.76	+	10.46	+	0.36	+	7.07	+	11.70	+	3.17
	6 Years	+	136.42	-	16.18	-	1.17	+	35.38	-	20.47	-	10.71	-	5.81	-	30.62
Professional and Technical Schools	1930-31	+	6.42	+	1.56	+	5.62	+	0.36	+	41.67	+	0.80	+	7.58	+	4.69
	1931-32	+	1.42	-	0.92	-	1.34	-	4.63	+	9.41	-	4.42	-	6.78	-	4.88
	1932-33	-	8.73	-	7.79	-	7.38	-	23.66	-	7.66	-	11.53	-	11.53	-	11.53
	1933-34	-	10.45	-	6.94	-	9.86	-	3.70	+	1.41	-	3.63	-	3.00	-	1.03
	1934-35	-	4.40	+	3.15	+	3.09	+	37.50	+	7.13	+	9.13	+	12.07	+	15.34
	6 Years	-	18.03	-	6.11	-	16.06	-	11.44	-	11.58	-	13.11	-	21.68	-	13.57

the figures will prove interesting to anyone who has the patience to study them. In some of the groupings, particularly in the univer-

TABLE IV
DEGREES CONFERRED IN THE SEVERAL TYPES OF INSTITUTIONS
ARRANGED BY GEOGRAPHICAL DIVISIONS

GEOGRAPHICAL DIVISION	YEAR	UNIVERSITIES		LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGES		TEACHERS COLLEGES		PROFESSIONAL SCHOOLS	
		NUMBER OF DEGREES	PER CENT GAIN OR LOSS	NUMBER OF DEGREES	PER CENT GAIN OR LOSS	NUMBER OF DEGREES	PER CENT GAIN OR LOSS	NUMBER OF DEGREES	PER CENT GAIN OR LOSS
North Atlantic States	1930	14,459		5,772		102		1,202	
	1931	15,203	+ 5.15	6,078	+ 5.30	127	+ 24.51	1,265	+ 5.24
	1932	16,311	+ 7.29	6,294	+ 3.55	136	+ 7.09	1,319	+ 4.27
	1933	16,596	+ 1.75	5,763	- 8.44	190	+ 39.71	1,335	+ 1.21
	1934	16,350	- 1.48	5,691	- 1.25	222	+ 16.84	1,238	- 7.27
	1935	15,672	- 4.15	5,829	+ 2.42	310	+ 39.64	1,213	- 2.02
	6 Yr. Pd.		+ 8.39		+ 0.99		+203.92		+ 0.92
South Atlantic States	1930	3,114		2,052		163		783	
	1931	3,290	+ 5.65	2,157	+ 5.12	204	+ 25.15	799	+ 2.04
	1932	3,595	+ 9.27	2,176	+ 0.88	278	+ 36.27	916	+14.64
	1933	3,648	+ 1.47	2,155	- 0.97	297	+ 6.83	890	- 2.84
	1934	3,521	- 3.48	2,080	- 3.48	283	- 4.71	964	+ 8.31
	1935	3,766	+ 6.96	2,114	+ 1.63	270	- 4.59	790	-18.05
	6 Yr. Pd.		+20.94		+ 3.02		+ 65.64		+ 0.89
North Central States	1930	19,624		3,782		1,254		1,238	
	1931	20,739	+ 5.68	3,890	+ 2.86	1,486	+ 18.50	1,339	+ 8.16
	1932	21,347	+ 2.93	4,030	+ 3.60	1,754	+ 18.03	1,395	+ 4.18
	1933	20,822	- 2.46	3,829	- 4.99	1,879	+ 7.13	1,294	- 7.24
	1934	19,348	- 7.08	3,791	- 0.99	1,774	- 5.59	1,304	+ 0.77
	1935	19,138	- 1.09	3,777	- 0.37	1,705	- 3.89	1,122	-13.96
	6 Yr. Pd.		- 2.48		- 0.13		+ 35.96		- 9.37
South Central States	1930	5,288		1,292		1,263		291	
	1931	5,411	+ 2.33	1,204	- 6.81	1,387	+ 9.82	281	- 3.44
	1932	6,092	+12.59	1,308	+ 8.64	1,346	- 2.96	292	+ 3.91
	1933	6,047	- 0.74	1,162	-11.16	1,356	+ 0.74	319	+ 9.25
	1934	5,771	- 4.56	1,309	+12.65	1,227	- 9.51	473	+48.28
	1935	5,797	+ 0.45	1,392	+ 6.34	1,324	+ 7.91	518	+ 9.51
	6 Yr. Pd.		+ 9.63		+ 7.74		+ 4.83		+78.01
Western States	1930	6,336		924		132		225	
	1931	6,939	+ 9.52	1,031	+11.58	202	+ 53.03	224	- 0.44
	1932	7,506	+ 8.17	1,035	+ 0.39	240	+ 18.81	267	+19.20
	1933	7,538	+ 0.43	1,133	+ 9.47	248	+ 3.33	276	+ 3.37
	1934	7,038	- 6.63	1,028	- 9.27	259	+ 4.44	277	+ 0.36
	1935	7,229	+ 2.71	1,118	+ 8.75	339	+ 30.89	298	+ 7.58
	6 Yr. Pd.		+14.09		+21.00		+156.82		+32.44

NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS OF EACH TYPE IN EACH DIVISION

	NORTH ATLANTIC	SOUTH ATLANTIC	NORTH CENTRAL	SOUTH CENTRAL	WESTERN	TOTAL
Universities	27	13	27	12	20	99
Liberal Arts Colleges	46	31	59	25	12	173
Junior Colleges	0	0	8	8	7	23
Teachers Colleges	2	6	11	10	4	33
Professional Schools	6	3	5	3	2	19
TOTAL	81	53	110	58	45	347

sities and liberal arts colleges in all geographical divisions, I think that reasonably reliable general trends are shown.

Table IV shows the total number of degrees conferred in each type

of institution in each geographical division. The same general trends are shown here as were pointed out in connection with Tables I and II. Although the numbers of teachers colleges contributing to the figures in all divisions are small, it is interesting to note the large net increases in degrees awarded by the teachers colleges, in spite of the persistent decreases in enrolments shown in the same institutions in all geographical divisions except the Western states (see Table III). In the North Central states all types of institutions had a net total decrease in degrees except the teachers colleges. In all other divisions there were net total increases in all types of institutions.

Table V shows the total enrolments in individual curricula together with the percentage increase or decrease year by year, the net total percentage over the first four years from 1930 to 1934 and over the five-year period. It did not seem feasible to list these data by various types of institutions, since very few institutions except the universities, for which the data are available, offer many of the curricula. Hence all institutions have been grouped together in this table. It is interesting to note that three curricula—agriculture, home economics, and liberal arts—in which there were net total decreases over the first four years, produced increases when the fifth year is added. Seven other curricula—architecture, business administration, education, engineering, music, medicine, and graduate—had smaller net decreases or larger increases over the five-year period than over the first four years. One curriculum, divinity, changed from an increase to a decrease with the addition of the fifth year, and the remaining four had larger decreases or smaller gains. One of these is pharmacy, which had the largest net decrease except one in the four-year period and now has the largest net decrease of all curricula. Only agriculture, home economics, law, and liberal arts had net increases.

An apparent discrepancy appears here, in that the individual curricula all show net losses or very small increases, whereas the general registration figures in Tables I and II show larger net gains. The reason for this is that the figures for individual curricula were not available for 1929-30, and the net percentages in Table V are based on the year 1930-31 which was a peak year in enrolments. The net percentages in Tables I and II are based on the year 1929-30 which had almost uniformly smaller enrolments.

Table VI gives the figures for total degrees conferred in various

TABLE V
SUMMARY OF ENROLMENTS IN INDIVIDUAL CURRICULA

CURRICULA	ENROLMENTS						PERCENTAGE GAIN OR LOSS				
	1930-31	1931-32	1932-33	1933-34	1934-35		1931-32	1932-33	1933-34	1934-35	
Agriculture	11,869	11,677	10,668	10,485	12,766		- 6.39	8.64	- 1.72	+ 21.95	- 11.66
Architecture	2,629	2,461	2,053	1,918	1,949		+ 5.82	- 16.58	- 6.56	+ 1.62	- 27.04
Art	550	582	589	534	429		+ 5.82	+ 1.20	- 9.34	- 19.66	- 2.91
Business Administration	35,239	34,150	30,018	28,690	30,662		- 3.09	- 12.10	- 4.44	+ 6.87	- 18.58
Dentistry	3,897	3,838	3,549	3,471	3,456		- 1.51	- 7.53	- 2.20	- 0.43	- 10.93
Divinity	889	860	945	912	868		+ 3.26	+ 9.88	- 3.49	- 5.92	+ 2.59
Education	74,650	71,471	58,393	58,393	59,973		- 4.56	- 18.30	- 2.71	- 17.58	- 15.35
Engineering	48,481	45,536	40,230	36,858	39,156		- 6.07	- 11.65	- 8.38	- 23.97	- 19.23
Home Economics	9,242	9,277	8,857	8,713	9,640		+ 0.38	- 4.53	- 1.63	+ 10.64	- 5.72
Law	9,378	9,052	9,226	9,503	9,480		- 3.48	+ 1.92	+ 3.00	- 0.24	+ 1.33
Liberal Arts	185,117	184,573	177,579	182,959	194,773		- 0.29	- 3.79	+ 3.03	+ 6.46	- 1.17
Music	6,022	5,294	5,173	5,028	5,091		- 12.09	- 2.29	- 2.80	+ 1.25	- 16.51
Medicine	10,196	10,344	10,492	10,429	10,685		+ 1.45	- 1.43	- 0.60	+ 2.43	+ 4.80
Pharmacy	6,612	3,326	4,619	4,234	4,023		- 5.10	- 13.27	- 8.34	- 4.98	- 28.31
Graduate	35,959	36,763	34,574	36,842	38,468		+ 2.24	- 5.95	+ 6.36	+ 4.41	+ 2.46

TABLE VI
SUMMARY OF DEGREES BY MAJOR FIELD

MAJOR FIELD	NUMBER OF DEGREES						PERCENTAGE GAIN OR LOSS				
	1930-31	1931-32	1932-33	1933-34	1934-35		1931-32	1932-33	1933-34	1934-35	
Agriculture	1,736	1,840	1,739	1,653	1,611		+ 5.99	- 5.49	- 4.95	- 2.54	- 4.78
Architecture	1,376	1,389	1,481	1,384	1,408		+ 4.57	+ 23.65	- 90.17	+ 6.25	- 7.20
Biological Science	1,976	2,156	2,322	2,134	2,175		+ 9.11	+ 7.70	- 8.10	+ 1.92	- 9.68
Business Administration	4,471	4,802	4,601	4,691	4,385		+ 7.40	- 2.92	- 5.08	+ 6.52	+ 10.07
Classical Languages	765	638	546	461	442		- 16.60	- 14.42	- 15.57	- 4.12	- 1.92
Dentistry	864	981	920	892	913		+ 13.54	- 6.22	- 3.04	+ 2.35	- 42.22
Divinity	100	74	87	63	84		- 26.00	+ 17.57	- 37.33	+ 3.24	+ 5.67
Education	9,519	10,670	11,166	10,193	9,839		+ 12.09	- 4.65	- 8.71	+ 33.33	- 16.00
Engineering	6,549	7,191	7,324	7,388	7,026		+ 8.80	+ 1.85	+ 0.87	- 3.47	+ 3.38
English	3,576	3,884	3,441	3,118	3,012		+ 8.61	- 11.41	- 9.39	+ 4.90	+ 7.28
Fine Arts	1,369	1,975	1,832	1,941	1,847		+ 44.27	- 7.24	+ 5.95	- 3.40	- 15.77
Forestry	1,326	1,350	1,307	1,275	1,321		+ 7.36	- 12.29	- 10.42	- 4.84	+ 34.92
Home Economics	1,902	2,013	1,997	1,927	2,002		+ 5.84	- 0.79	- 3.51	+ 3.89	- 1.53
Law	2,115	2,048	1,869	1,926	2,024		- 3.17	+ 8.74	+ 3.05	+ 3.89	+ 5.26
Mathematics and Physical Sciences	2,076	2,484	2,495	2,746	3,564		+ 19.65	+ 0.44	+ 10.06	+ 5.09	- 8.94
Medicine	2,564	2,523	2,576	2,872	2,821		- 1.60	+ 2.10	+ 11.49	- 1.78	+ 10.02
Modern Language	1,851	1,797	1,709	1,552	1,511		- 2.92	- 4.90	- 9.19	- 2.64	- 18.37
Pharmacy	992	955	864	926	562		- 3.73	- 9.53	+ 7.18	- 36.07	- 40.32
Social Science	5,194	5,170	4,989	4,917	4,898		- 0.46	- 3.50	+ 1.44	- 0.39	- 6.65

major fields of study, with net percentage increases or decreases over the same four and five-year periods. Eight of the major fields had larger net gains or smaller losses over the five-year period than over the first four years. The remaining eleven major fields had smaller gains or larger decreases over the five-year period. Business administration is the only major field in which there was a change from a net increase to a decrease. The largest net decreases appear in classical languages in which there is a continuous downward trend, and in pharmacy in which there was a decided drop in 1934-35. Net increases of more than 10 per cent appeared in four fields: biological science, fine arts, mathematics and physical science, and medicine. The large increase in mathematics and physical science, in 1934-35, is not entirely a genuine increase, since, on account of the form of the questionnaire this year, in a number of cases this field includes degrees in chemistry which previously were reported under a separate heading. It does seem clear, however, that even without this artificial addition mathematics and physical science continues to be the only field that shows an increase constantly throughout the whole period covered by the data. Classical languages, modern languages, and social sciences had consistent decreases throughout the period.

Some interesting comparisons may be made between Tables V and VI. Although architecture had almost continuous decreases year by year and a large net decrease in enrolment, yet in degrees conferred there were almost continuous increases year by year; architecture is one of the four fields in which there was a net increase of over 10 per cent. Agriculture, which in enrolment had a large enough increase in 1934-35 to overcome previous continuous decreases and to show a net increase for the five-year period, continues to have a net decrease in degrees conferred. Business administration, which had continuous enrolment decreases through 1933-34 with a net four-year increase in degrees, turns up in 1934-35 with an enrolment increase and a drop in degrees. In dentistry, the situation is similar to architecture though not nearly so pronounced. Engineering, which had enrolment decreases continuously except in the last year, had also degree increases in every year except the last. Home economics and medicine are the only fields in which there were net total increases over the five-year period in both enrolment and degrees. Business administration, divinity, and pharmacy are the only fields that had net total decreases in both enrolment and degrees.

Table VII, another new departure from last year's study, gives an analysis of degrees by grade or type in the various types of institutions. The numbers of professional and doctors' degrees conferred by the liberal arts and teachers colleges and professional schools are too small to have any significance. In the other groupings, however,

TABLE VII
SUMMARY OF DEGREES BY TYPE

TYPE OF INSTITUTION	YEAR	BACHELORS		MASTERS		PROFESSIONAL		DOCTORS		HONORARY	
		No.	PER CENT GAIN OR LOSS	No.	PER CENT GAIN OR LOSS	No.	PER CENT GAIN OR LOSS	No.	PER CENT GAIN OR LOSS	No.	PER CENT GAIN OR LOSS
Universities	1931	34,203		8,132		3,073		1,168		205	
	1932	35,528	+ 3.87	9,445	+16.15	2,803	- 8.79	1,376	+17.81	195	- 4.88
	1933	34,733	- 2.24	9,770	+ 3.44	3,007	+ 7.28	1,376	0.0	216	+10.77
	1934	33,474	- 3.62	8,410	-13.92	2,768	- 7.95	1,430	+ 3.92	201	- 6.94
	1935	33,536	+ 0.19	8,175	- 2.79	2,829	+ 2.20	1,474	+ 3.08	207	+ 2.99
	5 Yr. Pd.		- 1.95		+ 0.53		- 7.94		+26.20		+ 0.98
Liberal Arts Colleges	1931	12,893		275		50		8		176	
	1932	13,292	+ 3.09	276	+ 0.36	49	- 2.00	9	+12.50	197	+11.93
	1933	12,757	- 4.02	295	+ 6.88	42	-14.29	12	+33.33	178	- 9.64
	1934	12,561	- 1.52	453	+53.56	36	-14.29	18	+50.00	239	+34.27
	1935	12,846	+ 2.27	325	-28.26	33	- 8.33	15	-16.67	246	+ 2.93
	5 Yr. Pd.		- 0.36		+18.18		-34.00		+87.50		+39.77
Teachers Colleges	1931	3,405		331		0		21		0	
	1932	3,732	+ 9.60	397	+19.94	0		17	-19.05	0	
	1933	3,932	+ 5.36	445	+12.09	15		26	+52.94	1	
	1934	3,790	- 3.61	287	-35.51	25		19	-26.92	1	
	1935	3,977	+ 4.93	273	- 4.88	41		23	+21.05	0	
	5 Yr. Pd.		+16.80		-17.52				+ 9.52		
Professional Schools	1931	3,669		542		45		83		9	
	1932	3,729	+ 1.64	625	+15.31	31	-31.11	90	+ 8.43	8	-11.11
	1933	3,644	- 2.28	598	- 4.32	35	+12.90	104	+15.56	9	+12.50
	1934	3,967	+ 8.86	389	-34.95	25	-28.57	105	+ 0.96	10	+11.11
	1935	3,593	- 9.43	472	+21.34	26	+ 4.00	118	+12.38	8	-20.00
	5 Yr. Pd.		- 2.07		-12.92		-42.22		+42.17		-11.11
TOTAL (All Schools)	1931	54,170		9,280		3,168		1,280		390	
	1932	56,281	+ 3.90	10,743	+15.77	2,883	- 9.00	1,492	+16.56	400	+ 2.56
	1933	55,066	- 2.16	11,108	+ 3.40	3,099	+ 7.49	1,518	+ 1.74	404	+ 1.00
	1934	53,792	- 2.31	9,539	-14.12	2,854	- 7.91	1,572	+ 3.56	451	+11.63
	1935	53,952	+ 0.30	9,245	- 3.08	2,929	+ 2.63	1,630	+ 3.69	461	+ 2.22
	5 Yr. Pd.		- 0.40		- 0.38		- 7.54		+27.34		+18.21

there appear to be sufficient numbers to give some indication of trends. In the bachelors' degrees there was a net total decrease in all types of institutions except the teachers colleges. Curiously enough, the teachers colleges had a considerable net decrease in masters degrees whereas the universities and arts colleges had a net increase. There was a net loss of professional degrees throughout, but a large net increase of doctors' degrees, which is continuous through all five years in the totals for all institutions and also in

the universities, except that the number is exactly the same in 1932 and 1933.

There were alternating decreases and increases of honorary degrees from year to year, with a net increase of less than one per cent. Note that at the end of the four-year period, in 1934, there was a net decrease of nearly two per cent. In the liberal arts colleges the situation is quite different. Here we find increases in 1932, 1934, and 1935 with a net increase of nearly 40 per cent. Honorary degrees in the teachers colleges are nearly non-existent and in the professional schools are too few to have any significance.

In conclusion, let me say that I have in this paper attempted to point out merely some of the more outstanding features of the analysis. A further reading of the statistical tables will doubtless reveal many other interesting and curious comparisons. I, therefore, leave them with you at this point for your further perusal.

Business Session

PRESIDENT BRIGHT: Before we begin the business session, there are three points that I should like to mention briefly.

I have here a beautiful walnut gavel that was received during the convention from Mr. Mayer, the Chairman of the Committee on Local Arrangements at the convention last year. There was a little money left from the transportation adjustment and Mr. Mayer has purchased this beautiful gavel, with the silver band suitably engraved, in memory of our Raleigh convention. It is the property of the Association and will be turned over to the new president. I am sure that we are very grateful indeed to Mr. Mayer for his thoughtfulness in sending this very appropriate gift.

I received this morning this telegram:

Nothing disappoints like missing a registrars' meeting.
Best wishes. Ezra L. Gillis.

MR. HOFFMAN: Mr. Bright, I move we respond to that telegram immediately.

The motion was passed.

PRESIDENT BRIGHT: I have a letter here from Santa Barbara, California, the author of which is well known to the older registrars of this group. It reads as follows:

Dear Colleagues:

Please accept the greetings and best wishes of a retired registrar who would rejoice to be with you in this gathering, in the home of the founding of our association. Despite the great progress that has been made in these years, there remain to the registrars opportunities for further important contributions to the cause of higher education. My best wishes for your success in dealing with these problems.

Sincerely,
Walter A. Payne.

MR. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I would like to move that replies be made to Mr. Payne and also to Mr. Hillegeist and Mr. Espenshade, whose messages were read at the dinner.

The motion was passed.

PRESIDENT BRIGHT: We shall now proceed to the business session. We shall hear the reports of the committees. I shall ask first for a report from Ira M. Smith, Chairman of the Committee on Special Projects.

Mr. Smith read the following report.

GENERAL REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE
ON SPECIAL PROJECTS

During the year 1935-36, the Committee on Special Projects received a suggestion from the Chairman of a special committee of the National Association of Deans and Advisers of Men relative to joint action in establishing a procedure for estimating fraternity scholarship and standardizing the methods of reporting fraternity scholarship.

Your committee gave sympathetic consideration to the proposal and assured the committee from the Deans' Association of our readiness to co-operate. However, plans did not mature for immediate action during the current year. It was possible, through the good co-operation of the President of our Association, to arrange for a general session on the program of the Twenty-Fourth Convention of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars to present reports from four of our member institutions on "The Registrar's Office as a Service Station for Scholarship Charts, Reports, and Statistics" as well as a paper by the Chairman of the Committee on Scholarship of the National Interfraternity Conference on "Problems in Obtaining Uniform Fraternity Scholarship Reports."

A member of your committee attended the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association held in St. Louis, Missouri, February 22-27, 1936. Your committee is of the opinion that the American Association of Collegiate Registrars should continue to co-operate with the American Educational Research Association but that it should not be asked to pay any annual membership dues. It is recommended that the Chairman of the Committee confer with the Secretary-Treasurer of the Research Association relative to a plan of co-operative action for the coming year so as to avoid the annual membership fee.

Respectfully submitted,

IRA M. SMITH, *Chairman*

R. N. DEMPSTER

FRED L. KERR

J. P. MITCHELL

K. P. R. NEVILLE

RODNEY M. WEST

REPORT ON ENROLMENT STATISTICS AND
DEGREES—FRED L. KERR

This report is published on page 493.

REPORT ON PROJECTS, 1935-36—IRA M. SMITH

NOTE: Does not include studies published in the *Bulletin* during the year.

College Majors

"Study of Records of Students Majoring in Social Science," W. H. Morton, University of Nebraska. Publishing problematical.

"Study of Records of Students Taking a Degree with a Major in Mathematics," C. C. Camp, University of Nebraska. Not published.

"Study Relating to College Concentrations and Teaching Fields," Edwin H. Scott, Registrar, Georgia State College for Women. In mimeographed form.

Curriculum Studies

"Curricular Changes in the Colleges of the Southern Association for the Ten Year Period, 1925 to 1935," C. O. Douglass, Registrar, Tennessee Wesleyan College. In progress.

"Report of Committee on Curriculum," Faculty Committee, Massachusetts State College.

Freshman Class Studies

"Percentage of Each Original Freshman Class, Beginning with 1920, Withdrawing Permanently During Each Year, and the Percentage Ultimately Graduating," G. S. Patterson, Registrar, Wake Forest College. In progress.

"Scholastic and Personality Ratings of Each Member of the Freshman Class," Harry E. Elder and V. E. Breidenbaugh, Indiana State Teachers College. In mimeographed form.

"The Scholarship Index of Each of 179 Constituent High Schools as Determined by the Scholarship Records in Indiana State Teachers College of 596 Freshmen During the Regular School Years of 1933-1934 and 1934-1935," Harry E. Elder, Registrar, Indiana State Teachers College. In mimeographed form.

Grade Studies

"Comparative Study, by Class and Department, of Students Elected to Phi Beta Kappa," A. R. Congdon, University of Nebraska.

"Comparative Study of Phi Beta Kappa Students Entering with and without Advanced Credit," University of Nebraska. Not published.

"Study of Average Grade Earned by 5000 Students over a Stated Period of Time," Registrar's Office, University of Nebraska. Not published.

"Study of Grades, Credit Hours, and Courses to Determine the Median Grade of Classes and a Comparison of Grading Systems," A. R. Congdon, University of Nebraska. Not published.

"Study of Grades of Pre-medic Students as a Basis for Entrance to our Medical College," Dr. Otis Wade, University of Nebraska. Not published.

Prediction of College Success

"Comparison of the College Aptitude Test and Rank in High-School Graduating Class as Factors for Predicting Freshman Scholarship," T. E. Pettengill, Assistant Registrar, University of Minnesota.

"Relation of High-School Experience to College Success, Emphasizing Secondary-School Guidance and Motivation," E. B. Stevens, Registrar, University of Washington. Continuation of study began five years ago with an initial report of progress in the *Washington Educational Journal*, December 1931 and January 1932.

"Student Mortality and the Degree of Accuracy with which Failure to Meet the Requirements of the Standard Program Can Be Predicted," Registrar's Office, Oregon State College. In mimeographed form.

"Study of High-School and College Relations Using Admission and College Records from 1910 to the Present," E. B. Stevens, Registrar, University of Washington. In progress.

"The Relation of Social and Economic Factors to Success in College," Haven Hubbard, University of Chicago. Unpublished Master's thesis.

Teaching

"Certification of Teachers in Ohio and a Proposed Plan of Reorganization," F. B. Dilley, Registrar, Ohio University. Published by Teachers College Bureau of Publications, Columbia University.

"Teaching Positions in 'Special' Subjects in Indiana Public Schools," Harry E. Elder, Registrar, Indiana State Teachers College. In mimeographed form.

Miscellaneous

"A Ten Year Study of Placement Examinations," H. H. Armsby, Registrar, Missouri School of Mines and Metallurgy.

"Comparative Study of Regents Scholars as to Rank, Mortality, etc.," A. A. Reed, University of Nebraska. Not published.

"Information That Should Be Available on a Permanent Non-Academic Record," Sophia M. Uhlken, Registrar, Nebraska State Normal College. In mimeographed form.

"Method of Interpreting to the Faculty the Significance of Psychological Test Scores," Wyatt W. Hale, Dean and Registrar, Birmingham-Southern College. Summary in January, 1936, *Bulletin of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars*.

"Placement of 1934 Graduates," Harry E. Elder, Registrar, Indiana State Teachers College. In mimeographed form.

"Report of the Experiment of the Handling of the Fall Quarter Grades, Which Involved the Use of the Triple Class Ticket," Ben Husbands, Associate Registrar, University of North Carolina. In progress.

"Student Credit Sheet, Showing at the End of Each Semester an Exact Summary of Credits Earned and To Be Earned in Respect to Each of the Requirements for the A.B. Degree," Theron Clark, Registrar, University of Southern California.

"Study of Summer School Students Who Are Also Registered For Extension Work," A. A. Reed, University of Nebraska. Not published.

"Survey of Institutional Objectives in Terms of Student Attitudes as Given in Sixty-eight College and University Catalogs," Erland Nelson, President, Dana College.

"The Distribution, by Functional Subject Groups, of High School and College Credit of Nine Typical 1934 Graduates of Indiana State Teachers College," Harry E. Elder, Registrar, Indiana State Teachers College. In mimeographed form.

"The Program and Organization of Florida's New General College," Walter J. Matherly, Acting Dean of the General College, University of Florida. Published in November, 1935, issue of the *Journal of Higher Education*. Reprints available from the Registrar.

"Comprehensive Courses in Florida's New General College," Walter J. Matherly, Acting Dean of the General College. Will probably be published in *Journal of Higher Education*.

"The Provision of Facilities for the Higher, Professional, and Technical Education of Negroes in North Carolina," S. Herbert Adams, Registrar, Johnson C. Smith University.

REPORT ON LIST OF ACCREDITED INSTITUTIONS—J. P.
MITCHELL

There is really little to say except to comment on the routine for building up the report. The photographic process which we began this year is cheaper than printing and, as the different subdivisions are reworked, you will ultimately have it all in the photographic form.

One question came up this year concerning which some formal action should perhaps be taken by the Association. At the beginning we occasionally received requests from reputable institutions, not members of the Association, for copies of the report, and the Committee authorized me to sell the reports to such institutions at \$1 each. The demand has increased somewhat. This year I turned over \$40 to the Treasurer from that source. Now, it has been suggested that an annual charge be made for this service. A man who received this report and has been getting the annual renewals wrote in to say that he thought it was about time he paid something more, that he had received more than \$1 worth and felt that he was imposing on us. Perhaps it would be well for the Association to decide what to do and not leave it entirely to committee action. It occurs to me it would be entirely reasonable to make a charge of \$1 a year for this report, for organizations not members of this group, with the understanding that if they pay \$1 a year they are entitled to the ritual report and the annual renewals.

This recommendation was referred to the Executive Committee with power to act.

MR. SMITH: The other part of our report has to do with the studies that are turned in yearly through the *Bulletin* and which are printed year by year. I shall not read them, because they will appear in print.

At this stage I would like to have an expression from the group here as to whether or not this Committee has outlived its usefulness. Does anyone have an opinion that he would like to express?

MR. BIXLER: Mr. Chairman, I believe the Committee has not outlived its usefulness. I understand that the regional associations may be entering into certain research activities in the near future in co-operation with the central organization. I believe the Committee will be needed in the guidance of those activities.

MR. SMITH: I have heard some criticism of the form of the statistical report. It is claimed that it is difficult to file. As you recall, we published it in printed form at one time and it was rather expensive. We reduced the cost considerably. Mr. West, how much did we reduce the cost by using the planographing process?

MR. WEST: More than half.

MR. SMITH: I think the Committee would be very glad to have opinions expressed in letter form to Mr. Kerr.

If the Committee is continued under the present membership, they propose to follow up the excellent report made last year by Mr. Quick. You will recall that it was one of the most elaborate reports we have made. In the report last year, which is on page 279 of the *Proceedings* (July, 1935), there are five recommendations. Among others, I find Recommendation No. 4, "The Study of Grades, Grading and Testing Procedure." I believe that the Committee on Special Projects will undertake that study this coming year through your good co-operation.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that is all of my report and I respectfully submit it for adoption.

The report was adopted.

PRESIDENT BRIGHT: I am sure we all regret the absence of the Chairman of the Committee on Professional Education, Mr. Ezra L. Gillis. Miss Cockins, have you any report for this committee?

MISS COCKINS: The Committee has no report.

PRESIDENT BRIGHT: Now, I think we might combine the next report, that of the Board of Editors, which is one of our very important committees. I shall call for the report of the Committee, and at the same time for the report of the Editor himself, whom we consider as one of the major officers of the organization, Mr. Bixler.

MR. BIXLER: Mr. Chairman, I believe that most of you will agree with me that the quality of the articles published in the *Bulletin* during the last year has been better than in previous years since I have been Editor. You will be interested to know that the Editors have selected as the best paper of the year one by True Pettingill, published in the April number, on the following subject—"A Comparison of the College Aptitude Test and Rank in High School Graduating Class as Factors for Predicting Freshman Scholarship."

As I come to the point of making my last report as Editor of the *Bulletin*, I am inclined to look backward. And it is not with any feeling of regret, in retrospect, that I made the response I did to

Miss Cockins, in 1932, in Chicago, when she asked me if I would allow my name to be presented for Editor of the *Bulletin*. I accepted the responsibility with fear and, possibly, with some trembling, but my spirits were buoyed up by the encouraging words of some of the registrars who had been in the harness longer than I had. I cannot forget the effect of the long talk that I had with J. C. MacKinnon about the value of the *Bulletin* to the Association and the standards of quality that a bulletin of such an association as ours should represent. I remember that he said that he and others felt it should be a journal that would hold its place among the standard journals in the field of education, and he seemed to be confident that that ideal could be reached. Others gave similar encouragement, and I doubt that any of these people realize how much credit they deserve for any progress that has been made in these four years.

I cannot pass without paying tribute to the executive committees who have provided such generous financial support for the *Bulletin*. It is difficult to anticipate accurately what the *Bulletin* will cost in a given year, and twice they approved expenditures beyond the appropriation, in order that the program of the Editor be not hindered in the least. Such an attitude on the part of the officers merits the best efforts of any editor.

Enough of looking backward. We can now look forward with confidence that the *Bulletin* is in good hands. We have chosen a man to carry on who is thoroughly competent. His ideals for the *Bulletin* are high, and he will work toward those ideals with intelligence and persistence. He merits your complete confidence and your united support. Give it to him as you have given it to me and you will be amply repaid by what he will show you at the end of the first three years. I should add that we have further reason to believe in the next Editor of the *Bulletin*, because he spent the night before last, before accepting this responsibility, in prayer and meditation. (Applause.)

PRESIDENT BRIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Bixler. I am sure that most of us have had sufficient experience in editing catalogues and other bulletins to have a deep appreciation for what Mr. Bixler has been doing for several years. I consider that he has made a tremendous contribution to the Association in giving us one of the finest bulletins of any educational body.

What is your pleasure in regard to Mr. Bixler's report as Committee Chairman and as Editor of this Association?

MISS COCKINS: Mr. President, since I asked Mr. Bixler if he

would serve, I move this organization express to Mr. Bixler our appreciation for his four years of hard work.

PRESIDENT BRIGHT: I am sure there are plenty of seconds to that motion.

MR. MATHEWS: I move to amend the motion by saying "very successful work."

The motion, as amended, was passed.

PRESIDENT BRIGHT: We shall now hear the Report of the Budget Committee. Dr. K. P. R. Neville.

DR. NEVILLE: Mr. President, the Budget Committee begs to submit the following budget:

ESTIMATE OF RECEIPTS, 1936-37

	1935-36		1936-37
	<i>Estimated</i>	<i>Actual Net</i>	<i>Estimated</i>
Interest.....	\$ 70.00	\$ 79.36	\$ 93.46
Dues.....	3,250.00	3,398.00	3,400.00
Sale of <i>Bulletin</i>	40.00	80.72	50.00
Subscriptions to <i>Bulletin</i>	75.00	96.60	85.00
Combined exhibit space at Convention and advertising in <i>Bulletin</i>	200.00	261.40	200.00
Total.....	\$3,635.00	\$3,916.08	\$3,828.46

PROPOSED BUDGET, 1936-37

	1935-36		1936-37
	<i>Appropriations</i>	<i>Disbursements</i>	<i>Proposed Budget</i>
President's office.....	\$ 100.00	\$ 79.63	\$ 100.00
Second Vice-President's office.....	25.00	18.67	25.00
Secretary's office.....	50.00	27.18	50.00
Treasurer's office.....	150.00	150.00	150.00
Editor's office.....	2,300.00	2,594.88	2,500.00
Convention.....	500.00	304.91	500.00*
Committee on Special Projects.....	500.00	367.62	500.00
Monograph.....			500.00
Total.....	\$3,625.00	\$3,542.89	\$4,325.00

* Estimated difference between Convention expense and receipts.

K. P. R. NEVILLE, *Chairman*
J. G. QUICK
ALAN BRIGHT

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the report.

The report was adopted.

PRESIDENT BRIGHT: In coming to the Committee on Local Arrangements and Registration, I feel that I must say a word of appreciation in behalf of our entire membership of the efforts of this large Committee in making our stay here in Detroit most enjoyable. I have some notion of many hours of work that Mr. Baldwin and his colleagues have put in upon the task of making us happy here. I think that we have had a wonderful convention and we are very grateful indeed, Mr. Baldwin, to you and to all the members of the Committee; I am sure you have done a great job for us. Have you any reports other than the ones you have been making from time to time?

MR. BALDWIN: The only thing I would like to say is that there were 309 registered, including visitors. There were 211 convention fees paid and 211 people at our banquet.

PRESIDENT BRIGHT: It might interest the Convention to know that 309 is the largest convention in our history. I believe the next largest was in Chicago in '32, where we had 282.

I should like to say a word concerning the Committee on Transportation. For many years we have had quite a scramble to secure the minimum number in order to enjoy the reduced rate home. And for the first time in our history, Mr. McHugh has arranged in advance with the railroads to give us the lower rate regardless of the number we may bring. And it is rather curious that the first time that privilege is granted by the railroads we are represented at the Convention with a registration of more than 300.

The next is the Committee on Office Forms and Filing Equipment. Mr. M. E. Gladfelter, Temple University.

MR. GLADFELTER: Mr. President, I should like to say first that I feel very deeply the responsibility which was placed upon me, and the confidence which has been expressed in my ability by promoting me to the office of Editor. I said to many of you that I felt Mr. Bixler deserved congratulations upon being able to retire, because I am conscious of the amount of work involved in publishing a bulletin of the type the Association has published. I did go into a huddle with Bixler and Dyrness and a few others and we did pray about it rather seriously, and I shall tell you three years from now whether our prayers have been answered.

I should just like to take a minute or two to tell you about one

particular thing we have in mind, because I shall not have you together again for a year.

We realize that we cannot do a great deal to improve the quality of the publication and that if we can keep it at its present standard we shall have done much, but we are concerned particularly about the circulation of the *Bulletin*. We have laid some plans for the promotion of the circulation, and sometime next fall each registrar who is a member of the Association will receive a letter from the Circulation Manager of the *Bulletin*, in which a special subscription rate will be offered to member institutions. We believe that the plan followed by the Association of American Colleges, whereby institutions that are members of the Association can receive a special rate by taking several subscriptions to the *Bulletin*, can just as easily apply to the *Bulletin* of this association. Accordingly, we shall ask the registrars to recommend to the libraries and library committees and to other officers responsible for additions to the list of publications for the institutions that they urge the person or persons in their institution to add one or two or three subscriptions. The new rate has not yet been approved. It will be submitted to the Executive Committee and after it is approved you will receive the plan. We hope that we shall be able to step up the number of subscriptions by 300 or 500 by this plan alone. Then there are other plans that go with it.

Mr. Gladfelter read the following report.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON OFFICE FORMS AND FILING EQUIPMENT

Since our last convention the Display Case of Office Forms has been examined by twelve registrars located in seven states. It was also exhibited at one state convention. Mr. Donald R. Fitch, of Denison University, has been in charge of the circulation of the case.

Several unit collections have been added to the display. Your committee recommends that:

1. The registrars send to the Chairman of the Committee samples of new office forms and records to be included in the display.
2. That registrars prepare unit collections for the display.
3. That all members who wish to have the display shipped to their institutions file a request with the Chairman of the Committee.

The number of exhibitors for the twenty-sixth convention sur-

passes that of the several preceding meetings. Through the co-operation of Mr. E. J. Soop, a very attractive display has been arranged. Ten companies manufacturing and publishing materials which are of interest to registrars have contracted for exhibits and space in the *Bulletin*. The income from advertisements in the *Bulletin* and exhibits at the convention totals \$311.50.

I am pleased to report that the total income exceeds that anticipated by the Budget Committee.

Respectfully submitted,
M. E. GLADFELTER, *Chairman*
D. R. FITCH
ALMA H. PREINKERT
E. J. SOOP

PRESIDENT BRIGHT: We come now to the report of the Committee on Resolutions, Mr. J. G. Quick, Chairman. Mr. Quick read the following report.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON RESOLUTIONS

1. Whereas, the members of the Committee on Local Arrangements and Registration, under the capable leadership of Mr. J. W. Baldwin, have willingly assumed and faithfully discharged the numerous duties incident to preparation for this convention, and by so doing have made our sojourn in Detroit both pleasant and profitable; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the American Association of Collegiate Registrars extend to the Committee on Local Arrangements and Registration a vote of thanks for their much appreciated service.

2. Whereas, the representatives of the University of Michigan, Michigan State Normal College, University of Detroit, Wayne University, Marygrove College, Highland Park Junior College, and Merrill Palmer School have graciously co-operated in promoting the success of this meeting, and

Whereas, the delightful music furnished by the Madrigal Club of the Michigan State Normal College; and of the Wayne University Ensemble contributed much to our enjoyment at the Annual Dinner, and

Whereas, those kindly serving as guest speakers on the program of all sessions have rendered valuable assistance through their contributions, and

Whereas, the Edison Institute, through its courtesy and co-operation, made possible the visit to the Institute—an experience rich in educational interest—and

Whereas, the management of the Hotel Statler has provided efficient and courteous service, adding to our pleasure and comfort throughout the convention, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the American Association of Collegiate Registrars extend to these individuals and institutions a vote of thanks, and that the Secretary of the Association send to them appropriate letters conveying this expression of appreciation.

3. Whereas, the Association has learned of the protracted illness of one of its esteemed members of long standing, Mr. Hugh H. Caldwell, of the Georgia School of Technology; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the American Association of Collegiate Registrars, through its Secretary, convey to Mr. Caldwell, its sincere expression of best wishes for a speedy and complete recovery.

4. Whereas, the Association has been informed of the election of Mr. Charles E. Friley to the presidency of the Iowa State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, and

Whereas, Mr. Friley was for many years an active, progressive member, and since 1933 an honorary member, of the Association; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the American Association of Collegiate Registrars transmit to President Friley its congratulations on his recent appointment and extend to him the hope that he will enjoy the happy and successful administration that his past accomplishments so clearly predict.

5. Whereas, the Association has received word concerning the death, on March 15, 1935, of Dr. George O. Berg, of St. Olaf College; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the American Association of Collegiate Registrars record in this manner its feeling of deep regret over the passing of one of its members.

6. Whereas, our members have, with sorrow, learned of the death, on April 10, 1936, of Dr. Charles R. Compton, Registrar Emeritus of The College of Wooster; and

Whereas, in this Association there are many who knew Dr. Compton intimately and cherished his warm friendship, and

Whereas, Dr. Compton, as Chairman of the Association Committee on Uniform Transcript Blanks, made a notable contribution

toward a more efficient transfer of students from undergraduate colleges to professional schools and universities; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the American Association of Collegiate Registrars send to Mrs. Compton and her family this expression of sympathy and our feeling of loss of an earnest and devoted worker who contributed so much toward the progress and good fellowship of his profession.

7. Whereas, at this convention, through the contribution made by President Charles J. Turck in his address on "The Recruiting of College Students," the Association has had placed before it a report on certain pernicious aspects of the practices that are detrimental to the cause of higher education; and

Whereas, the nature of this problem, related so closely to that of admissions, makes it a matter of primary concern to all collegiate registrars; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that a co-operative study of student recruiting be conducted through the agency of the regional associations and under the direction of the Committee on Special Projects of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars.

Respectfully submitted,

J. G. QUICK, *Chairman*

A. H. LARSON

C. P. STEIMLE

The report was adopted.

(Wednesday Morning Business Session)

PRESIDENT BRIGHT: Ladies and gentlemen, at this point in the Convention, at the close of the morning of the second day, it has been our custom to hear the report of the Nominating Committee. As you know, this committee is a standing committee throughout the year and its task is to choose the officers of the Association for the coming year. We shall now hear the report of the Nominating Committee. Mr. Stone.

MR. STONE: In accordance with the amended Constitution that was adopted last year, two officers hold over. The Secretary was elected last year for three years. He holds for two years longer. The Treasurer, Miss Deters of the University of Buffalo, was elected last year for two years. She holds over for an additional year. So the Committee makes no nominations for those offices naturally. For the other offices the Committee makes the following nominations:

For President—Mr. J. R. Sage, of Iowa State College.

For Vice-President—Mr. Fred L. Kerr, of the University of Arkansas.

For Second Vice-President—Miss Lorena M. Church, of Rockford College.

For Editor for three years—Mr. M. E. Gladfelter, of Temple University.

PRESIDENT BRIGHT: The report of the Committee is before you. What is your pleasure?

MR. HOFFMAN: Mr. President, I move the Secretary be instructed to cast the ballot for the slate as read.

The motion was passed.

I move the adoption of the report, Mr. Chairman.

The report was adopted.

PRESIDENT BRIGHT: I believe we have concluded the reports of Committees. I shall now ask the Second Vice-President to make her report, Miss Elinor R. Wells, Flora Stone Mather College of Western Reserve University. Miss Wells has done a notable piece of work in developing our membership. She will tell you the extent of her work.

MISS WELLS: I wish to make the following report:

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF MEMBERSHIP OVER FIVE-YEAR PERIOD

	1935-36	1934-35	1933-34	1932-33	1931-32
Active members	689 ¹	661	662	697	711
Honorary members	10	10	9	8	9
Total	699	671 ²	671	705	720
Added since last Convention	42 ³	21	13	29	11
Resigned or dropped during year	13 ⁴	20	44	48	39
Resigned for one year only	1	6	3	2	4
Net increase or decrease	+28	-5	-34	-15	-31

¹ Including 17 new members with dues credited to year 1936-37.

² Including 5 members who paid for 1934-35 in 1933-34 but did not appear in that tabulation.

³ Including 1 new honorary member.

⁴ Including 1 honorary member, deceased.

PRESIDENT BRIGHT: That is very good work, Miss Wells. We are very grateful. May we consider that a motion has been made and seconded to approve the report? As many as favor the motion will say "Aye." Contrary. Carried.

I shall now ask Mr. J. R. Robinson, the Secretary, to report for the Executive Committee. He will report to us as our Secretary and will also report the Regional Association Conference. You have three capacities in making this report, Mr. Robinson.

MR. ROBINSON: The report of the Executive Committee is brief. We had two rather protracted sessions, at which a number of things were discussed, but the actions were few.

At the meeting, Monday evening, April 13, it was voted that Mrs. Anna T. Boyer, formerly Registrar of Bradley Polytechnic Institute, be elected to honorary membership in this Association.

Because of an unexpected increase in the cost of printing the *Bulletin*, it was voted the budget of the Editor during the past year be revised to cover the additional amounts needed, estimated at approximately \$250.

At the meeting on Wednesday afternoon, April 15, it was voted that a Monograph Committee of three be appointed and a working fund of \$500 be set aside to be used for the publication of approved monographs.

MR. ROBINSON: At the meeting of the Affiliated Regional Association Conference, Wednesday, April 15, thirty members were present, consisting of the Executive Committee, Regional Associations, Editor of the *Bulletin* and representatives from eleven regional associations, as follows: Colorado-Wyoming, Florida, Illinois, Kansas, Middle States, Nebraska, North Carolina, Northwest, South Carolina, and Texas.

There was some doubt as to the steps necessary for affiliation by a branch association. It was suggested that the Regional Association Editor call attention in the *Bulletin* to the Constitutional Regulations regarding affiliation. It was also suggested that a list of all sections of Regional Associations be printed in order to facilitate inter-communication between the different regional associations and with the national association.

A number of things were discussed but no action was taken that is required to be presented to this body.

I move the adoption of the report.

The report was adopted.

TREASURER'S REPORT—E. E. DETERS

STATEMENT OF CASH RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS FOR THE
PERIOD JUNE 1, 1935, TO MAY 31, 1936*Balance—June 1, 1935*

Manufacturers & Traders Trust Company—checking account.....	\$ 891.14	
Buffalo Savings Bank—savings account.....	3,061.34	
Editor's petty cash fund.....	15.10	\$3,967.58

Receipts

Interest on savings account balance.....	\$ 79.36	
From membership dues		
1932-33 (1).....	\$ 5.00	
1933-34 (7).....	35.00	
1934-35 (15).....	75.00	
1935-36 (638).....	3,190.00	
1936-37 (19).....	93.00	3,398.00
Subscriptions to <i>Bulletin</i>	96.60	
Sale of single copies of <i>Bulletin</i>	80.72	
Sale of Reports on Accrediting of Educational Institutions.....	40.00	
Sale of extra copies of Report on Enrolment and Degrees.....	2.85	
1935 Convention—exhibit space.....	25.00	
<i>Bulletin</i> advertising and Convention exhibit space.....	261.40	
Receipts from 1936 Convention tickets.....	1,135.70	5,119.63
		<u>\$9,087.21</u>

Disbursements

	Budget	Charges against budget
President's office.....	\$ 100.00	\$ 79.63
Second Vice-President's office.....	25.00	18.67
Secretary's office.....	50.00	27.18
Treasurer's office.....	150.00	150.00
Editor's office.....	2,300.00	2,594.88
Committee on Special Projects.....	500.00	367.62
Convention (expense over income)...	500.00	304.91
	<u>\$3,625.00</u>	<u>\$3,542.89</u>
Bank charges—collection costs, exchange, etc.....		21.00
Disbursements covered by 1936 Convention receipts.....	1,135.70	4,699.59
<i>Balance May 31, 1936</i>		<u><u>\$4,387.62</u></u>

Represented by:

Manufacturers & Traders Trust Company—checking account.....	\$ 396.92
Buffalo Savings Bank—savings account.....	3,990.70
	<hr/>
	\$4,387.62
	<hr/>

AUDITORS' REPORT

We hereby certify that the foregoing Statement of Receipts and Disbursements of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars for the period June 1, 1935, to May 31, 1936, is in agreement with the books and correctly sets forth the financial transactions for the period and the funds on hand at the end of the period.

MEECH HARMON LYTLE BLACKMORE

Buffalo, New York

June 1st, 1936

I move the adoption of the report.

The report was adopted.

PRESIDENT BRIGHT: Now, ladies and gentlemen, I believe that brings us to the end of our program. Your Chairman has reached the end of his task. A wonderful spirit prevails in this organization. As the President faces the problem of building up the program for the Convention, which must be planned well in advance, he has the assurance, as he goes along, that we have very helpful members. I can truthfully say that I have enjoyed deeply the work of this year because of the willing help that came from all quarters. It has been a great pleasure to have this honor for one year.

I wish the incoming President great success. I know he is able and I am sure this organization is going to go on to fields of greater usefulness. I thank all of you and all of the speakers for your wonderful help, and I wish you a fine year until we meet again.

It is now my privilege to present to you your President-elect, Mr. J. R. Sage. (Applause.)

PRESIDENT-ELECT SAGE: I assure you I appreciate very deeply this great honor which you have bestowed upon me. I was very reluctant to undertake the Presidency and should have refused to accept the nomination had it not been for my realization that, as Mr. Bright said a moment ago, the entire organization is very willing to co-operate in any assignment that is made. I am also reassured by statements which have been made to me by various individual

members assuring me they are very willing to accept any assignment that may be made to them during the year.

There is one announcement in which you will be interested, that is, in regard to the place of meeting next year. The Executive Committee has considered this question very carefully. We had numerous invitations. Furthermore, we had in mind the rotation of locations for the sessions which is provided by the Constitution. On the other hand, we took advantage of the provision in the by-laws which places in the hands of the Executive Committee the power to waive that rotation for good cause. It did not seem to be wise or even feasible to take the convention to the far West next year. Of course, this question of "West" needs definition. Some of the people who are attending here today, may regard Detroit as the "far West." After careful consideration of all the aspects of this problem, the Executive Committee has decided to hold the next Convention at Kansas City, Missouri. We trust this decision will meet with the general approval of the Association.

With reference to the dates for next year, we are taking a chance on beginning the meeting on the thirteenth of April, so we are announcing the dates as April 13-14-15, provided this does not conflict with the meetings of the North Central Association. In case there is a conflict, the Executive Committee will announce very promptly the change of dates. (Applause.)

PRESIDENT BRIGHT: Is there any new business to be brought before the Convention? Or any point that we have not covered?

Ladies and gentlemen, the 24th Convention is hereby adjourned.

De Paul University Honors John C. McHugh

On the evening of May 16, 1936, De Paul University tendered a banquet to Mr. John C. McHugh, University Examiner, as a testimonial of his twenty-five years of service to that institution. The banquet was held at the Palmer House in Chicago.

Following is a synopsis of the speech of congratulation delivered by the Very Reverend Michael John O'Connell, C. M., President of the University:

St. Augustine, somewhere in his writing, in speaking of the guardian angel that each individual has who records his good deeds and his misdeeds, comments that nations as well as individuals probably have guardian angels. I have never been able to find any other writer who voices the same thought, but it is an appealing one. Might we not extend the offices of the guardian angel and assign to institutions as well as to individuals and nations a guardian angel?

If any person or officer represents the guardian angel in a university, it is the registrar who records the deeds and misdeeds of the students, who keeps the conscience of the institution by barring with a flaming sword those who are unfit to enter the academic paradise, and who judges as to the fitness of those who go through the school and declares their worthiness or unworthiness for the reward of a degree on the basis of what he has written of their records.

The position of registrar is not a glamorous one. He seldom appears in the public eye. The students who are deserving take him for granted, he incurs the enmity of those who are undeserving; but in the scheme of university administration he plays a part that is in many ways as important as any other officer or professor. Perhaps even more so, in that his work is enduring and final, while that of the other officers may be transitory in its effects.

Too frequently the work of men such as Mr. McHugh is taken for granted by the university administration as well. I am delighted to have the opportunity of expressing publicly my appreciation of the noble work that Mr. McHugh has done for the past twenty-five years in keeping the records, in writing the academic history of De Paul University. It has been a work well done. When I see him surrounded on all sides by the books of records and realize that his is an interminable task, without the romance and the glamour and the enthusiasm that comes to the professor or to the president through the feeling that one has imparted a well worth while lesson, my admiration for his ability and the qualities required for work such as his is immensely increased.

May we always have registrars as faithful and as conscientious as you are, Mr. McHugh, and may our records be always as exact and as precise as you have made them; may your custodianship of the conscience of the University continue for many years to come; may you ever be as just in the debarring of the unfit and the admitting of those deserving as the high principles of the

academic standards demand. Good luck and long years in the very important part that you are playing in making the standards better from year to year.

Mr. Harry D. Taft, Assistant Dean of the De Paul University College of Law, acted as toastmaster. Mr. James J. Coughlin, a prominent attorney in Chicago and a member of Mr. McHugh's class, was speaker of the evening. Mr. Coughlin reminisced on many pleasant occurrences during their college days and congratulated his classmate on the honor which had been accorded him by the University.

The following registrars were present at the banquet: Mr. Ernest C. Miller, Registrar of the University of Chicago; Mr. Enock C. Dyrness, Registrar of Wheaton College; Mr. Bertram J. Steggert, Registrar of Loyola University, President of the Illinois Association of Collegiate Registrars; Miss Agness J. Kaufman, Registrar of Lewis Institute, Secretary of the Illinois Association of Collegiate Registrars; Miss Frances McElroy, Registrar of the National College of Education, Evanston; Miss Marie J. Meloy, Registrar of Lake Forest College; Mr. Joseph L. Kleiner, Registrar of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, De Paul University.

During the course of the evening congratulatory messages from President Sage and Secretary Robinson of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars, and from President Steggert of the Illinois Association of Collegiate Registrars were read.

Mr. McHugh acknowledges his appreciation of the presence of the aforementioned registrars at the banquet, and expresses gratitude also to those who, though unable to be present, nevertheless extended their congratulations on the occasion of his Silver Jubilee.

ORGANIZATION OF THE ASSOCIATION

OFFICERS, 1935-36

Alan Bright, <i>President</i>	Carnegie Institute of Technology
J. R. Sage, <i>First Vice-President</i>	
.....	Iowa State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts
Elinor R. Wells, <i>Second Vice-President</i>	
.....	Flora Stone Mather College of Western Reserve University
J. R. Robinson, <i>Secretary</i>	George Peabody College for Teachers
Emma E. Deters, <i>Treasurer</i>	University of Buffalo
Roy W. Bixler, <i>Editor</i>	University of Chicago

STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

SPECIAL PROJECTS

Ira M. Smith, <i>Chairman</i>	University of Michigan
R. M. West.....	University of Minnesota
Fred L. Kerr.....	University of Arkansas
J. P. Mitchell.....	Stanford University
K. P. R. Neville.....	University of Western Ontario
R. N. Dempster.....	Johns Hopkins University

PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

E. L. Gillis, <i>Chairman</i>	University of Kentucky
Edith D. Cockins.....	Ohio State University
J. R. Robinson.....	George Peabody College for Teachers
C. F. Ross.....	Allegheny College
C. P. Steimle.....	Michigan State Normal College

BOARD OF EDITORS

R. W. Bixler, <i>Editor</i>	University of Chicago
M. E. Gladfelter.....	Temple University
Emma E. Deters.....	University of Buffalo
E. C. Dyrness.....	Wheaton College
A. H. Larson.....	University of Rochester
M. E. Mattox.....	Eastern State Teachers College, Kentucky
J. P. Mitchell.....	Stanford University
Alma H. Preinkert.....	University of Maryland
A. F. Scribner.....	Valparaiso University
R. M. West.....	University of Minnesota

BUDGET

K. P. R. Neville, <i>Chairman</i>	University of Western Ontario
J. G. Quick.....	University of Pittsburgh
Alan Bright.....	Carnegie Institute of Technology

CONVENTION COMMITTEES, 1935-36

LOCAL ARRANGEMENTS AND REGISTRATION

J. W. Baldwin, <i>Chairman</i>	Wayne University
E. J. Soop.....	University of Michigan
Florence Donohue.....	University of Detroit
Sister Miriam Fidelis.....	Marygrove College
C. P. Steimle.....	Michigan State Normal College
D. L. Rich.....	University of Michigan
Marian Williams.....	University of Michigan
George Altenberg.....	Highland Park Junior College
Mabel R. Rodgers.....	Merrill-Palmer School

INTRODUCTION

C. P. Steimle, <i>Chairman</i>	Michigan State Normal College
E. J. Howell.....	A. & M. College of Texas
Alice L. Butler.....	Western College for Women
H. G. Arnsdorf.....	New York University
E. B. Stevens.....	University of Washington
J. V. McQuitty.....	University of Florida

TRANSPORTATION

John C. McHugh, <i>Chairman</i>	DePaul University
Ernest C. Miller.....	University of Chicago
J. A. Gannett.....	University of Maine
W. F. Kerr.....	Princeton University
E. J. Mathews.....	University of Texas
H. W. Chandler.....	University of Florida
H. M. Showman.....	University of California at Los Angeles

OFFICE FORMS AND FILING EQUIPMENT

M. E. Gladfelter, <i>Chairman</i>	Temple University
E. J. Soop.....	University of Michigan
D. R. Fitch.....	Denison University
Alma H. Preinkert.....	University of Maryland

NOMINATIONS

Ralph B. Stone, <i>Chairman</i>	Purdue University
Clara D. Hayes.....	Bowdoin College
E. C. Dyrness.....	Wheaton College
H. M. Showman.....	University of California at Los Angeles
J. G. Stipe.....	Emory University

RESOLUTIONS

J. G. Quick, <i>Chairman</i>	University of Pittsburgh
Mrs. Gretchen M. Happ.....	The Principia
A. H. Larson.....	University of Rochester

CONSTITUTION

ARTICLE I—NAME

The name of the organization shall be the American Association of Collegiate Registrars (hereafter referred to as the Association or the A.A.C.R.).

ARTICLE II—PURPOSE

The purpose of this Association shall be to provide, by means of annual conferences and otherwise, for the spread of information on problems of common interest to its members, and to contribute to the advancement of education in America.

ARTICLE III—MEMBERSHIP

Section 1. Active Membership. Any officer charged with the duty of registration, or of passing upon entrance credentials, or of recording the standing of students in any recognized institution of higher learning in the United States or in Canada, shall be eligible to active membership. It is understood that membership is either institutional or personal and that in institutions where there are two or more co-ordinate officers in charge of the duties referred to above, each such officer may become an active member.

Section 2. Associate Membership. Subordinate members of the staff of any officer qualified for active membership may be enroled as associate, non-voting members of the Association.

Section 3. Honorary Membership. Honorary membership may be recommended by any member of the Association to the Executive Committee. Election to honorary membership will rest with the Executive Committee, but only those who continue in some educational work, or who are retiring from active service, and only those who have been in the profession long enough, or who have been sufficiently active in the Association to warrant the assumption that they are interested in the Association's progress will be elected by the Executive Committee.

ARTICLE IV—OFFICERS

Section 1. The officers of the Association shall be a president, a first vice-president, a second vice-president, a secretary, a treasurer, and an editor. All officers shall be elected by ballot at the annual meeting, a majority vote of those present and voting being necessary to elect. With the exception of the treasurer, they shall hold office from the adjournment of the meeting at which they are elected until adjournment of the meeting in which their successors are elected. The treasurer shall hold office from the beginning of the fiscal year following his election until the close of the fiscal year in which his successor is elected.

Section 2. The officers named in Section 1, together with the immediate past president, shall constitute an Executive Committee, with power to fix the time and place of the next annual meeting as provided in the by-laws, to assist the president in arranging the program, and to make other necessary arrangements.

ARTICLE V—AFFILIATED REGIONAL ASSOCIATION CONFERENCE

The Affiliated Regional Association Conference (hereafter referred to as the A.R.A.C.) shall be composed of delegates from affiliated regional associations of registrars. The conference and the executive committee jointly shall have power to co-ordinate the activities of the regional associations and the A.A.C.R.

ARTICLE VI—AMENDMENTS

This constitution may be amended at any annual meeting by a two-thirds vote of the members present and voting, provided that notice of the proposed amendment has been sent to the members at least one month in advance of the meeting. An amendment not thus proposed in advance may be adopted by a four-fifths vote of the members present and voting.

BY-LAWS

ARTICLE I—FEES

Section 1. The annual membership fee for active members shall be \$5.00 and for associate members \$3.00. The fee shall, in both cases, include a subscription to the *Bulletin*.

Section 2. Any member who shall fail to pay annual dues for two consecutive years will, after notice in writing from the treasurer, be dropped automatically from the list of members.

Section 3. There shall be a convention registration fee of two dollars (\$2.00) paid by one representative of each institution represented at the annual convention.

Section 4. There shall be no membership or registration fee for honorary members. Such members shall be given complimentary subscriptions to the *Bulletin*.

ARTICLE II—MEETINGS

Section 1. The Association shall hold an annual meeting in April of each year, the location and date to be chosen by the Executive Committee, which shall also have the power to advance, postpone, or omit an annual meeting in case of emergency.

Section 2. The geographical rotation scheme for the location of meetings, as adopted at the Atlanta convention in 1927, shall be followed; provided, however, that a variation may be made in any year for good and sufficient reason by action of the Executive Committee or by vote of the Association.

ARTICLE III—TERM OF OFFICE AND DUTIES OF OFFICERS

Section 1. The president and two vice-presidents shall hold office for one year each. The term of office for the secretary, treasurer, and editor shall be three years each, one of these officers to be elected each year. Should any annual meeting be omitted (or the time for it changed) the time between two consecutive meetings shall be counted as one year in the administration of the provisions of this section.

Section 2. The president shall assume full responsibility for all the general activities of the Association, conduct all necessary correspondence with the members in regard to the annual program, and, with the assistance of the Executive Committee, arrange the program. All bills must be approved by the president before payment.

Section 3. The first vice-president shall act as the chief assistant of the president, and shall succeed to that office in case it becomes vacant.

Section 4. The second vice-president shall have charge of the campaign for extending the membership of the Association. This officer, together with the president, secretary, and treasurer, shall determine eligibility for membership in the Association. He shall succeed to the presidency in case of a vacancy in both the preceding offices.

Section 5. The secretary shall keep an accurate list of the members of the Association, correcting same from time to time upon the advice of the treasurer. He shall be the custodian of the records of the Association. He shall keep the minutes of the annual meeting and of the meetings of the Executive Committee.

Section 6. In addition to the usual duties of the office, the treasurer shall collect the membership dues and shall report changes in the list of members to the president, second vice-president, secretary and editor. He shall secure the approval of the president on all bills before payment. He shall prepare an informal report to be presented to the members of the Association at the time of the annual meeting. At the close of the fiscal year, he shall make a complete formal report, audited by a certified public accountant, to be presented to the Executive Committee for publication in the next issue of the *Bulletin*. The expense of the audit shall be defrayed by the Association.

Section 7. The editor shall edit, publish, and distribute the *Bulletin* of the Association and any other official publications issued in the name of the Association.

Section 8. The Executive Committee shall have authority between annual meetings to fill any vacancy not otherwise provided for in this article.

ARTICLE IV—REGIONAL ASSOCIATIONS

Section 1. Any group of registrars may form a regional association, with the right to (a) determine its own constitution in accordance with local needs but in every respect consistent with the constitution of the A.A.C.R.; (b) to determine its own boundary lines with due consideration for those of existing regional associations, and to determine its own membership of collegiate institutions or the appropriate officers thereof; (c) to elect its own officers, to conduct its meetings according to regional interests and needs, and to determine its membership fees, number of meetings, etc., except as hereinafter provided.

Section 2. Any regional association of collegiate registrars may become affiliated with the A.A.C.R. on the following terms:

(a) The regional association shall appoint or elect an official delegate, preferably the president or a past president of that association, to the A.R.A.C.

(b) These delegates shall meet once a year with the Executive Committee

of the A.A.C.R. at the time of the annual meeting of the Association to plan jointly a co-ordinated program of activity for the A.A.C.R. and the regional associations.

(c) The regional association shall submit to the editor for publication in the *Bulletin*, subject to his approval, the program and proceedings of its annual meeting and the best papers, studies, or projects presented at each annual or other meeting.

Section 3. If feasible, regional association meetings shall be held annually, but at a time not conflicting with the national meeting.

ARTICLE V—COMMITTEES

Section 1. There shall be a Budget Committee of three members, consisting of the president-elect, the retiring president and the next preceding president. The senior member of the committee in point of service shall act as chairman. Should any of these members be unable to serve, the retiring president shall appoint a substitute.

Section 2. There shall be a standing Committee on Special Projects, of five or more members, appointed by the president, whose duty it shall be to supervise any special projects referred to it by the Association, to co-ordinate so far as possible the activities of the Association and of individual members or groups of members in educational research, and to collect and disseminate information concerning study projects undertaken by various members.

Section 3. There shall be appointed by the president a Nominating Committee of five members whose duty it shall be to select nominees for the several elective offices and report to the Association on the second day of the annual meeting. At this time, opportunity shall be given for additional nominations from the floor.

Section 4. The editorial staff shall consist of the editor and nine associate editors appointed annually by the editor. The editor shall be responsible for the distribution of work among the associate editors.

Section 5. Nothing in this article shall be construed as preventing the appointment of additional standing or special committees deemed necessary for the work of the Association.

ARTICLE VI—FISCAL YEAR

The fiscal year of the Association shall extend from June 1 to May 31.

ARTICLE VII—AMENDMENTS

These by-laws may be amended at any annual meeting by a majority vote of the members present and voting, provided that notice of the proposed amendment has been sent to the members at least one month in advance of the meeting. An amendment not thus proposed in advance may be adopted by a two-thirds vote of the members present and voting.

DELEGATES AND GUESTS IN ATTENDANCE AT THE TWENTY-THIRD NATIONAL CONVENTION

A

- Aden, Fred E., Registrar and Counselor, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo.
Allison, Helen M., University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario, Can.
Alsop, Kathleen, Registrar, William and Mary College, Williamsburg, Va.
Arden, Wesley, International Business Machine Corporation, New York, N. Y.
Armsby, H. H., Registrar and Student Adviser, Missouri School of Mines and Metallurgy, Rolla, Mo.
Ashby, W. S., Business Manager and Registrar, Bowling Green College of Commerce, Bowling Green, Ky.

B

- Bacon, J. H., Registrar, Kalamazoo College, Kalamazoo, Mich.
Baker, Myron S., Assistant to the President, Hiram College, Hiram, Ohio
Baldwin, J. W., Registrar, Wayne University, Detroit, Mich.
Bass, Hortense, Registrar, Fort Smith Junior College, Fort Smith, Ark.
Bernreuter, R. G., Pennsylvania State College, State College, Pa.
Bixler, Roy W., Director of Admissions, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
Bly, J. M., Registrar, Saint Olaf College, Northfield, Minn.
Bowen, Olga, Registrar, John B. Stetson University, DeLand, Fla.
Bowman, Mrs. Kathleen Adams, Registrar, Milligan College, Milligan College, Tenn.
Boyer, Mary, Alumni Representative, Hiram College, Hiram, Ohio
Brennan, George F., Wayne University, Detroit, Mich.
Brenneman, Elsie, Registrar, Illinois State Normal University, Normal, Ill.
Bright, Alan, Registrar, Carnegie Institute of Technology, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Bristol, Jennie H., Registrar, Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vt.
Brother Agatho, F. S. C., Registrar, Manhattan College, New York, N. Y.
Brother Hubert Arthur, Registrar, St. Mary's College, Winona, Minn.
Brown, Betty, Culver Military Academy, Culver, Ind.
Brown, Grace N., Registrar, Hood College, Frederick, Md.
Bundy, Mary Ruth, Registrar, Ottawa University, Ottawa, Kans.
Burgoyne, Helen H., Assistant Registrar, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio
Bushman, Ruth L., Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.
Butler, Alice L., Registrar, Western College, Oxford, Ohio
Butterfield, George E., Dean, Bay City Junior College, Bay City, Mich.
Butterfield, George F., Bay City Junior College, Bay City, Mich.

C

- Campbell, James A., Registrar, Knox College, Galesburg, Ill.
Carlson, Karen, Registrar, Carroll College, Waukesha, Wis.
Carrel, Marian, University of Toledo, Toledo, Ohio
Carter, Asa, Registrar, Bradley Polytechnic Institute, Peoria, Ill.

- Casimir, Rev., Registrar, St. Francis College, Burlington, Wis.
Cawthon, N. M., Registrar, West Georgia College, University System of Georgia, Carrollton, Ga.
Chandler, H. W., Registrar, University of Florida, Gainesville, Fla.
Christensen, John C., Controller, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
Church, Lorena M., Registrar, Rockford College, Rockford, Ill.
Clack, Robert W., Registrar, Alma College, Alma, Mich.
Clevenger, G. H., Ball State Teachers College, Muncie, Ind.
Coale, Lorena, Assistant Registrar, Western Reserve Law School, Cleveland, Ohio
Cockins, Edith D., Registrar, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio
Conant, Robert, Registrar, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.
Congdon, Dr. Wray H., Director of Admissions, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pa.
Conger, Allen C., Registrar, Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio
Cookson, Thomas A., Assistant Registrar, Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind.
Cope, Frances K., Secretary, Asheville Normal and Teachers College, Asheville, N. C.
Cowdrey, Marjorie, Flora Stone Mather College, Cleveland, Ohio
Croft, Lysle W., Instructor, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky.
Cummings, John W., Director of Personnel, Maryville College, Maryville, Tenn.
Curtis, George B., Registrar and Associate Dean, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pa.

D

- Davis, Helene K., Assistant Registrar, National College of Education, Evanston, Ill.
Day, Vivian, Clerk, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
Dekker, H. G., Registrar, Calvin College, Grand Rapids, Mich.
Deming, Ruth, Butler University, Indianapolis, Ind.
Deters, Emma E., Registrar, University of Buffalo, Buffalo, N. Y.
Dickinson, Ella S., Registrar, Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass.
Dilley, F. B., Registrar and Chairman of Entrance Board, Ohio University, Athens, Ohio
Disert, Margaret C., Registrar and Adviser of Freshmen, Wilson College, Chambersburg, Pa.
Dobyns, J. S., Registrar and Financial Secretary, Southwestern State Teachers College, Weatherford, Okla.
Donohue, Florence, Registrar, University of Detroit, Detroit, Mich.
Doyle, S. R., Registrar, Florida State College for Women, Tallahassee, Fla.
Drew, L. M., University of Detroit, Detroit, Mich.
Duggan, Leo F., Registrar, Michigan College of Mining and Technology, Detroit, Mich.
Dunkelberger, Gustav, Dean, Chicago Musical College, Chicago, Ill.
Dunlap, H. B., Registrar, Lake Erie College, Painesville, Ohio
Dupont, F. F., Registrar, St. Norbert College, West DePere, Wis.

Dwenger, George H., Secretary, Long Island College of Medicine, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Dyrness, Enock C., Registrar, Wheaton College, Wheaton, Ill.

E

Eichkern, Gloryn C., Wayne University, Detroit, Mich.

Elder, Harry E., Registrar, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Ind.

Elliott, Kathleen, College Recorder, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass.

Enyart, Martha B., Acting Registrar, Butler University, Indianapolis, Ind.

F

Ferguson, Mary Jo, Assistant Registrar, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Ind.

Ferle, Anne L., Assistant Registrar, Michigan State College, East Lansing, Mich.

Fetters, Hazel, Mount Union College, Alliance, Ohio

Field, S. E., Registrar and Head of Department of Mathematics, Ironwood Junior College, Ironwood, Mich.

Fitch, Donald R., Registrar, Denison University, Granville, Ohio

Focke, Theodore M., Dean, Case School of Applied Science, Cleveland, Ohio

Foster, George O., Registrar, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kans.

Fricke, Irene L., Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.

Friend, Lloyd, Registrar, West Virginia University, Morgantown, W. Va.

G

Gannett, James A., Registrar, University of Maine, Orono, Maine

Gantt, Matsye, Registrar, State Agricultural and Mechanical College, Magnolia, Ark.

Gardner, Lucy, Secretary to the Dean, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky.

Gary, Annie Beth, Assistant Registrar, Southwestern, Memphis, Tenn.

Gary, Mrs. O. K., Southwestern, Memphis, Tenn.

Gehlbach, Dorothy, Registrar, Lindenwood College, St. Charles, Mo.

Geiner, Hazel D., Registrar, University of Toledo, Toledo, Ohio

George, Katharine, Registrar, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.

Gibbons, J. J., Dean and Registrar, Rockhurst College, Kansas City, Mo.

Gildersleeve, Helen, Assistant Registrar, Albion College, Albion, Mich.

Gladfelter, M. E., Registrar, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa.

Goodale, Pauline E., University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Grant, Carolyn R., Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

Grant, Edward J., Registrar, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

Grant, Mrs. Edward J., Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

Greene, Caroline B., Registrar Emeritus, Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass.

Griffin, Alice J., Director of Personnel Service, Wright Junior College, Chicago, Ill.

Grimm, Samuel O., Registrar, Lebanon Valley College, Annville, Pa.

Guinan, V. J., Registrar, Assumption College, Sandwich, Ontario, Can.

H

- Hagemeyer, Ada V., Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.
Hagemeyer, Frank H., Registrar, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.
Hagemeyer, Mrs. Frank H., Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.
Hagemeyer, Richard, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.
Haggard, Mrs. Mary Webb, Registrar, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.
Hale, Wyatt W., Dean and Registrar, Birmingham-Southern College, Birmingham, Ala.
Hannaford, Grace N., Registrar, Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio
Harris, Mrs. Ruth K., University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.
Harris, W. J., Registrar's Office, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.
Hastings, Lee, Wayne University, Detroit, Mich.
Hayes, Clara D., Secretary of the College, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Maine
Helmstadter, C. W., Registrar, Municipal University of Omaha, Omaha, Nebr.
Highberger, R. R., Jr., Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio
Highberger, Mrs. R. R., Jr., Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio
Hoekje, John C., Registrar, Western State Teachers College, Kalamazoo, Mich.
Hoffman, William S., Registrar, Pennsylvania State College, State College, Pa.
Hoffstetter, Fadelma, Assistant to the Registrar, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
Hogue, Inez, Registrar, Monmouth College, Monmouth, Ill.
Holter, H. W., Registrar, Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pa.
Howell, E. J., Registrar, A. and M. College of Texas, College Station, Texas
Howell, William R., Registrar, Washington College, Chestertown, Md.

J

- Jennings, Mrs. Hope, Editorial Assistant, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
Jioffre, Anne Marie, Wayne University, Detroit, Mich.
John, Dr. Walton C., United States Office of Education, Washington, D. C.
Jones, F. Taylor, Registrar, Drew University, Madison, N. J.

K

- Kaufmann, Fanni, Assistant to the Registrar, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
Kelly, Mrs. Marion, Marymount College, Tarrytown, N. Y.
Kennedy, Bessie M., Assistant to the Registrar, University of Detroit, Detroit, Mich.
Kent, A. E., Registrar, State Teachers College, Minot, N. D.

Kerr, Fred L., Registrar and Examiner, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Ark.

King, G. E., Registrar, Iowa Wesleyan College, Mount Pleasant, Iowa

Kirchhoefer, Esther, Valparaiso University, Valparaiso, Ind.

Kleefisch, Gertrude, Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind.

Kreiter, Florence L., Registrar, Hillsdale College, Hillsdale, Mich.

L

Laidly, Ann, Wayne University, Detroit, Mich.

Lamke, G. W., Registrar, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.

Larson, Arthur H., Secretary-Registrar, Eastman School of Music, Rochester, N. Y.

Lehn, H., Hunter College of the City of New York, N. Y.

Lehn, Mrs. Mary B. J., Registrar, Hunter College of the City of New York, N. Y.

Leib, David D., Registrar, Connecticut College, New London, Conn.

Leshner, C. Zaner, Registrar, University of Arizona, Tucson, Ariz.

Lill, Mrs. Bernice D., Registrar, Sweet Briar College, Sweet Briar, Va.

Linville, Dorothy, Assistant Officer of Admissions, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky.

Louckes, Velma E., University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Love, Donald M., Acting Dean, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio

Lower, Verna, Registrar, Mount Union College, Alliance, Ohio

Luger, A. E., Registrar, College of St. Thomas, St. Paul, Minn.

Lynghy, Genevieve, Registrar, Chicago Musical College, Chicago, Ill.

M

McCosh, Edna, Assistant Director, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Ind.

McCuaig, Mrs. D. H., Assistant Registrar, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, Ala.

McCune, E. H., Registrar, Southeastern Teachers College, Durant, Okla.

McGahey, Florence I., Registrar, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebr.

McGraw, S. L., Registrar, Concord State Teachers College, Athens, W. Va.

McHugh, J. C., Examiner, DePaul University, Chicago, Ill.

MacKinnon, J. C., Registrar, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.

McKnight, Carrie E., Registrar, Muskingum College, New Concord, Ohio

MacMorland, Wanda, Registrar, Emmanuel Missionary College, Berrien Springs, Mich.

McQuitty, John V., University of Florida, Gainesville, Fla.

Markowski, Mrs. Alina, University of Toledo, Toledo, Ohio

Marston, Frederick, Dean, Kemper Military School, Boonville, Mo.

Martin, Dora G., Registrar, American International College, Springfield, Mass.

Martin, G. M., Assistant Registrar, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.

Mathews, E. J., Registrar, University of Texas, Austin, Tex.

Metz, G. E., Registrar, Clemson College, Clemson, S. C.

Miller, E. C., Registrar, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

- Miller, Olga A., University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario, Can.
Milton, Mary Page, Registrar, Morehead State Teachers College, Morehead, Ky.
Mitchell, John P., Registrar, Stanford University, Stanford University, Calif.
Mollema, Edward C., Registrar, Detroit Institute of Technology, Detroit, Mich.
Morrow, Josephine, Registrar, Colorado College, Colorado Springs, Colo.

N

- Nelson, Alfred C., Registrar, University of Denver, Denver, Colo.
Neville, K. P. R., Registrar, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario, Can.
Noyer, Ralph, Dean, Ball State Teachers College, Muncie, Ind.
Nudd, Willard E., Case School of Applied Science, Cleveland, Ohio

O

- O'Hara, Frank J., Registrar, St. Thomas College, Scranton, Pa.
Olesen, Ella L., Registrar, University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho
Orlik, Francis, Registrar, St. Mary's College, Orchard Lake, Mich.

P

- Parrott, Alfred H., Registrar, North Dakota Agricultural College, State College, N. D.
Patterson, Grady S., Registrar, Wake Forest College, Wake Forest, N. C.
Paulhamus, Roberta, Registrar, Beaver College, Jenkintown, Pa.
Pearson, Norma C., Registrar, Northern Illinois State Teachers College, DeKalb, Ill.
Perry, C. D., Registrar, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, Ohio
Peters, Lucile, Registrar, Milwaukee-Downer College, Milwaukee, Wis.
Pettengill, Mrs. Gertrude M., University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
Pettengill, T. E., Assistant Registrar, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
Petty, Jess J., Registrar, Baldwin-Wallace College, Berea, Ohio
Platt, Elizabeth A., Wayne University, Detroit, Mich.
Player, Willa B., Registrar, Bennett College, Greensboro, N. C.
Poole, Elma, Registrar, St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo.
Porosky, Walter, Detroit Institute of Technology, Detroit, Mich.
Poundstone, W. J., Registrar, Southwestern College, Winfield, Kans.
Preinkert, A. H., Registrar, University of Maryland, College Park, Md.
Probst, Carrie M., Registrar, Goucher College, Baltimore, Md.

Q

- Quick, J. G., Registrar, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.

R

- Ramsay, Robert G., Registrar, Olivet College, Olivet, Mich.
Ramsey, Isabel, Assistant Registrar, Westminster College, New Wilmington, Pa.

- Reeves, William M., Registrar, Phillips University, Enid, Okla.
 Rich, D. L., Associate Registrar, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
 Richardson, Mary K., Registrar, College of Medicine, Wayne University, Detroit, Mich.
 Riordan, Robert B., Registrar, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Ind.
 Robertson, Mary A., Registrar, University of Alabama, University, Ala.
 Robinson, J. R., Registrar, Peabody College, Nashville, Tenn.
 Robinson, Mrs. J. R., Peabody College, Nashville, Tenn.
 Roe, Virfel, Registrar, Franklin College, Franklin, Ind.
 Rose, Nellie B., Registrar, Rio Grande College, Rio Grande, Ohio
 Ross, C. F., Registrar, Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa.
 Ryan, Rev. Carl J., Dean and Registrar, Teachers College Athenaeum of Ohio, Cincinnati, Ohio

S

- Sage, J. R., Registrar, Iowa State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, Ames, Iowa
 Schrader, Olive M., Registrar, University of Rochester, Rochester, N. Y.
 Schuytema, Guy L., Registrar, George Williams College, Chicago, Ill.
 Scott, Betty, Assistant, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
 Scott, Emma J., Registrar, Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa
 Scribner, A. F., Registrar, Valparaiso University, Valparaiso, Ind.
 Serenius, C. A., Registrar, Augustana College, Rock Island, Ill.
 Seyler, E. C., Recorder, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.
 Shear, Rose D., Transcript Clerk, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
 Shofstall, W. P., Dean, Stephens College, Columbia, Mo.
 Showman, Harry M., Registrar, University of California, Los Angeles, Cal.
 Sister Bertha, O. P., Registrar, Saint Joseph's College, Adrian, Mich.
 Sister Bertrand, Directress of Studies, Catholic Junior College, Grand Rapids, Mich.
 Sister Boniface Gaffney, Registrar, Albertus Magnus College, New Haven, Conn.
 Sister Celeste, Registrar, St. Mary-of-the-Woods, St. Mary-of-the-Woods, Ind.
 Sister Christella, Registrar, Clarke College, Dubuque, Iowa
 Sister Elizabeth Seton, Registrar, College of Mt. St. Joseph, Cincinnati, Ohio
 Sister Emmanuel, Cherokee Junior College, Cherokee, Iowa
 Sister Helen Joseph, Our Lady of the Elms, Chicopee, Mass.
 Sister Immaculata, O. S. F., College of St. Francis, Joliet, Ill.
 Sister Irmina Longstreth, Albertus Magnus College, New Haven, Conn.
 Sister Joan, Rosary College, River Forest, Ill.
 Sister Lillian Clare, Registrar, Webster College, Webster Groves, Mo.
 Sister Marie Arthur, Nazareth College, Nazareth, Mich.
 Sister Mary, Registrar, College of Saint Teresa, Winona, Minn.
 Sister M. Alice, Registrar, Mercyhurst College, Erie, Pa.
 Sister Mary Alma, Registrar, Mary Manse College, Toledo, Ohio
 Sister M. Anselma, O. P., Registrar, Saint Mary's of the Springs, East Columbus, Ohio
 Sister Mary Aquinas, Registrar, Notre Dame College, South Euclid, Ohio

- Sister Mary Borromeo, Registrar, Mount Mercy Junior College, Cedar Rapids, Iowa
- Sister M. Claudia McGrail, Registrar, Nazareth College, Nazareth, Mich.
- Sister Mary Cornelius, Guest, Our Lady of the Elms, Chicopee, Mass.
- Sister Mary Dorothy, Mary Manse College, Toledo, Ohio
- Sister Mary Eugenia, Registrar, Notre Dame Junior College, St. Louis, Mo.
- Sister M. Felix, Registrar, Catholic Junior College, Grand Rapids, Mich.
- Sister Mary Fidelis, O. P., Registrar, Rosary College, River Forest, Ill.
- Sister Mary Frances Chantal, Registrar, Mount Mary College, Milwaukee, Wis.
- Sister M. Frederick, Dean, St. Mary's College, Notre Dame, Ind.
- Sister M. Genevieve, Registrar, Saint Xavier College for Women, Chicago, Ill.
- Sister Mary Grace, Registrar, Our Lady of Cincinnati College, Cincinnati, Ohio
- Sister M. Magdalena, Registrar, St. Mary's College, Notre Dame, Ind.
- Sister Mary Michella, Dean of Women, Notre Dame College, South Euclid, Ohio
- Sister M. Monica, O. P., St. Mary's of the Springs, East Columbus, Ohio
- Sister M. Paula, Marygrove College, Detroit, Mich.
- Sister Mary Saint Helen, Registrar, Mundelein College, Chicago, Ill.
- Sister Mary Vivian, Registrar, Loretta Heights College, Loretta, Colo.
- Sister Mary Vivian, Registrar, Our Lady of Cincinnati College, Cincinnati, Ohio
- Sister Mercedes, O. S. B., Registrar, College of Saint Scholastica, Duluth, Minn.
- Sister Mildred, College of St. Francis, Joliet, Ill.
- Sister Miriam Fidelis, Registrar, Marygrove College, Detroit, Mich.
- Sister Paula, Registrar, Cherokee Junior College, Cherokee, Iowa
- Smith, Ira M., Registrar, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
- Smith, Mrs. Ira M., University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
- Smith, K. H., Michigan State College, East Lansing, Mich.
- Smith, Marjorie W., Registrar, Connecticut State College, Storrs, Conn.
- Smith, Truman C., Assistant to the Registrar, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
- Smittle, W. Roy, University of Detroit, Detroit, Mich.
- Smyser, W. C., Registrar, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio
- Sollars, Velna, Western Illinois State Teachers College, Macomb, Ill.
- Soop, E. J., University of Michigan, Extension Division, Detroit, Mich.
- Southwick, Arthur F., Registrar, College of Wooster, Wooster, Ohio
- Space, Helen M., Registrar, Keuka College, Keuka, N. Y.
- Sproat, G. A., Assistant Editor, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
- Stanley, Edith, Acting Registrar, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio
- Steggert, B. J., Registrar, Loyola University, Chicago, Ill.
- Steimle, C. P., Registrar, Michigan State Normal College, Ypsilanti, Mich.
- Stephens, B. C., Cashier, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
- Stephenson, Edythe, Registrar, Washington Missionary College, Washington, D. C.
- Steward, Donald H., Registrar, Central Y.M.C.A. College, Chicago, Ill.

Stone, Ralph B., Registrar, Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind.
 Stradley, B. L., University Examiner, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio

T

Tansil, Rebecca C., Registrar, State Teachers College, Towson, Md.
 Thomason, R. F., Registrar, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tenn.
 Thompson, Louise, Registrar, Shorter College, Rome, Ga.
 Titsworth, W. A., Registrar, Alfred University, Alfred, N. Y.
 Turosienski, S. K., United States Office of Education, Washington, D. C.
 Tuttle, G. P., Registrar, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.

U

Uhlken, Sophia M., Registrar, Nebraska State Normal College, Chadron, Nebr.
 Underwood, Lawrence C., Registrar, Hiram College, Hiram, Ohio

V

Voss, Hertha, Examiner, Western Illinois State Teachers College, Macomb, Ill.

W

Wagner, Herbert P., Chief Accountant, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
 Wagner, Velda L., Lindenwood College, St. Charles, Mo.
 Wallgren, A. Samuel, Dean and Registrar, North Park College, Chicago, Ill.
 Wedemeyer, Josephine, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
 Wells, Elinor R., Registrar, Flora Stone Mather College, Cleveland, Ohio
 Welmers, Thomas E., Registrar, Hope College, Holland, Mich.
 Wendell, H. U., Registrar, Atlantic Union College, South Lancaster, Mass.
 West, Miriam, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
 West, R. M., Registrar, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
 West, Mrs. R. M., University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
 White, Harold O., Registrar, Grove City College, Grove City, Pa.
 Whiteside, Annie C., Registrar, Randolph-Macon Womans College, Lynchburg, Va.
 Wilkins, Charlie S., Registrar and Dean of Students, John Tarleton Agricultural College, Stephenville, Texas
 Wilkinson, F. D., Registrar, Howard University, Washington, D. C.
 Williams, Marian, Statistician, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
 Williams, Nannie Mae M., Registrar, Fredericksburg State Teachers College, Fredericksburg, Va.
 Williams, Robert L., Registrar, Mississippi State College for Women, Columbus, Miss.
 Wilson, Thomas J., Dean of Admissions and Registrar, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.

Y

Yakeley, Elida, Registrar, Michigan State College of Agriculture and Applied Science, East Lansing, Mich.

Z

Zimmer, Virginia, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebr.

REGISTRATION BY STATES, 1936

Alabama.....	3	Mississippi.....	1
Arizona.....	1	Missouri.....	12
Arkansas.....	3	Nebraska.....	4
California.....	2	New Hampshire.....	1
Colorado.....	4	New Jersey.....	1
Connecticut.....	4	New York.....	18
District of Columbia.....	4	North Carolina.....	4
Florida.....	4	North Dakota.....	2
Georgia.....	2	Ohio.....	42
Illinois.....	30	Oklahoma.....	3
Idaho.....	1	Pennsylvania.....	16
Indiana.....	18	South Carolina.....	1
Iowa.....	7	Tennessee.....	11
Kansas.....	3	Vermont.....	1
Kentucky.....	5	Virginia.....	4
Maine.....	2	West Virginia.....	2
Maryland.....	5	Wisconsin.....	8
Massachusetts.....	8	Canada.....	4
Michigan.....	58		
Minnesota.....	10	Total.....	309

REGISTRATIONS OF MEETINGS

1910-36

Registrations	Year	Place	President
24	1910	Detroit	A. H. Parrott, North Dakota Agricultural College (Chairman)
30	1911	Boston	A. H. Espenshade, Pennsylvania State College (Chairman)
38	1912	Chicago	A. H. Espenshade, Pennsylvania State College
23	1913	Salt Lake City	J. A. Cravens, Indiana University
46	1914	Richmond	E. J. Mathews, University of Texas
55	1915	Ann Arbor	G. O. Foster, University of Kansas
69	1916	New York	Walter Humphries, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
66	1917	Lexington	*F. A. Dickey, Columbia University
106	1919	Chicago	A. W. Tarbell, Carnegie Institute of Technology
107	1920	Washington	E. L. Gillis, University of Kentucky
118	1922	St. Louis	*A. G. Hall, University of Michigan
160	1924	Chicago	J. A. Gannett, University of Maine
105	1925	Boulder	T. J. Wilson, Jr., University of North Carolina
155	1926	Minneapolis	G. P. Tuttle, University of Illinois
214	1927	Atlanta	R. M. West, University of Minnesota
253	1928	Cleveland	Ira M. Smith, University of Michigan

* Deceased.

119	1929	Seattle	C. E. Friley, Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas
250	1930	Memphis	E. J. Grant, Columbia University
232	1931	Buffalo	J. P. Mitchell, Stanford University
282	1932	Chicago	R. N. Dempster, Johns Hopkins University
266	1933	Chicago	J. G. Quick, University of Pittsburgh
219	1934	Cincinnati	F. O. Holt, University of Wisconsin
235	1935	Raleigh	K. P. R. Neville, University of Western Ontario
309	1936	Detroit	Alan Bright, Carnegie Institute of Technology

MEMBERSHIP OF THE ASSOCIATION

1914-36

Year	No. of Members	Year	No. of Members
1914	62	1927	504
1915	100	1928	622
1916	123	1929	696
1917	140	1930	749
1919	177	1931	754
1920	194	1932	720
1922	210	1933	705
1924	299	1934	671
1925	331	1935	671
1926	384	1936	699

A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A

A

I

I

I

I

INDEX TO VOLUME XI

- Abel, J. F., Evaluation of foreign credentials, 231-34
- Academic Freedom and Teacher Tenure, 165
- Accredited institutions, list of, convention report on, 509-10
- Adam Leroy Jones, 87
- Adjustment Problems of Freshmen*, 163
- Administrative Officers, 167
- Admission of freshmen, standards in the, 404-8
- Affiliated Regional Association, 140
- American Association of Teachers Colleges, 168
- American Council of Guidance and Personnel Associations' meeting, 75
- American Universities, Association of, conference, 158-59
- Arkansas Registrars' Association meeting, 152
- Armsby, H. H.: Registrar's reports on student grades, 361-74; relations of the registrar with parents of future, present, and past students, 419-24; symposium—registrar's office as a service station for scholarship charts, reports, and statistics, 361-403
- Association: of American Universities, conference, 158-59; of Kansas College Deans and Registrars and Advanced Standing Committees' meeting, 76
- Belhaven College one course plan, 254-56
- Bernreuter, Robert G., Uses and limitations of tests in selecting and placing students, 352-60
- Birmingham-Southern College, psychological test scores and honor-point ratios, 142-44
- Bixler, Roy W.: *Adjustment Problems of Freshmen*, 163; Affiliated Regional Association, 140; *Comparative Education*, 162; diploma mills, 59-69; *Education for an Age of Power* 162-63; *Redirecting Education*, 160-62; social forces affecting college entrance, 327-34; student recruiting, 138-40; what price degrees, 69
- Book reviews: *Adjustment Problems of Freshmen*, 163; *Comparative Education*, 162; *Education for an Age of Power*, 162-63; *Redirecting Education*, 160-62; *The Vectors of Mind*, 164-65
- Bradshaw, Francis F., Scope and aim of a personnel program, 41-49
- Brown, Richard R., National Youth Administration and the student, 342-51
- Budget Committee, convention report of, 512-13
- Business session, twenty-fourth national convention, 504-22
- Butler, Alice L., Summary of symposium—the registrar as the custodian of standards, 414-15
- Buying trends of registrars, queries in the questionnaire on, 311-12
- California, University of, protesting Assembly Bill #107, 73-74
- Cardwell, Dorothy, Queries in the questionnaire on buying trends of registrars, 311-12
- Carlson, William S., *The Vectors of Mind*, 164-65
- Catalog, college, the library in the, 50-54
- Cavan, Gordon T., Conflicts facing the changing college, 116-22
- Chandler, H. W.: Registrar and the questionnaire addict, 433-35; standards of evaluation of transfer credits, 409-11
- Chicago College Plan, The*, 82-84
- Chicago, University of, Senate investigation, 74

- Cockins, Edith D., Section A—universities, professional and technical schools, 449-77
- College: entrance, social forces affecting, 327-34; of the Fatherland, Philippine Islands, 257; Handbooks, 168
- Colorado-Wyoming Association of Collegiate Registrars, membership, 152
- Columbia University, New College, guiding the progress of students in, 215-22
- Committee on School and College Relations, third report of, 147-48
- Comparability of grades of different institutions, present obstacles to, 395-403
- Comparative Education*, 162
- Conference, Fourth Educational, 244-51
- Conflicts facing the changing college, 116-22
- Constance, Clifford L., Predicting academic achievement at the University of Oregon, 18-29.
- Constitution of the Association, 527-30
- Convention, twenty-fourth national: accredited institutions, report on, 509-10; Budget Committee's report, 512-13; business session, 504-22; delegates and guests in attendance, 531-39; Editor's report, 510-12; enrolments and degrees, report on, 505; Executive Committee's report, 519; Local Arrangements and Registration, Committee on, report, 513-14; Nominating Committee's report, 517-18; Office Forms and Filing Equipment, Committee on, report, 514-15; open forum, 486-92; organization of the Association, 525-26; program, 239-43; projects 1935-36, report on, 506-8; registration by states, 540; Resolutions, Committee on, report, 515-17; Second Vice-President's report on membership, 518-19; Section A—universities, professional and technical schools, 449-77; Section B—colleges of liberal arts, teachers colleges, junior colleges and normal schools, 478-85; Special Projects, Committee on, report, 505; symposium—the registrar as an administrator, 442-48; symposium—the registrar as the custodian of standards, 404-15; symposium—the registrar and his relations with the outside world, 416-41; symposium—the registrar's office as a service station for scholarship charts, reports, and statistics, 361-403; Treasurer's report, 520-21
- Co-operation between state university and high schools, 91-101
- Co-operative study of secondary school standards, 141-42
- Curriculum changes and the registrar, 478-83
- Degrees: conferred, enrolments and, over a six-year period, analysis of, 493-503; what price, 69
- Delegates in attendance at twenty-fourth national convention, 531-39
- DePaul University honors John C. McHugh, 523-24
- Diploma mills, 59-69
- Directory of registrars, 273-308
- Distribution of marks, 335-41
- Divisional system at Southwestern College, 256
- Drake, Raleigh M., and Winn, Elizabeth, Measuring student efficiency, 30-40
- Duerr, Alvan E., Present obstacles to comparability of grades of different institutions, 395-403
- Duties, professional, registrar and his, 102-6
- Dyrness, Enock C., Summary of Section B—colleges of liberal arts, teachers colleges, junior colleges and normal schools, 483-85

- Economic Outlook in Higher Education for 1935-36, The*, 271
- Editor, convention report of, 510-12
- Editorial comment: Affiliated Regional Association, 140; diploma mills, 59-69; student recruiting, 138-40; what price degrees, 69
- Education for an Age of Power*, 162-63
- Education under Communism Contrasted with that under Capitalism, 270-71
- Education Digest, The*, 272
- Educational news: Belhaven College one course plan, 254-56; College of Fatherland in the Philippine Islands, 257; divisional system at Southwestern College, 256; Fourth Educational Conference, 244-51; gifts for higher education, 251-53; student aid at Yale and Harvard, 253
- Educational Record, The*, Supplement No. 9, 272
- Educational Records Bureau, Committee on School and College Relations, third report of, 147-48
- Elder, H. E., Contributions of the registrar's office to the student personnel program at Indiana State Teachers College, 442-46
- Emme, E. E., *Adjustment Problems of Freshmen*, 163
- Enrolments and degrees conferred over a six-year period, analysis of, 493-503
- Evaluation: of foreign credentials, 231-34; of transfer credits, standards of, 409-11
- Examinations, proficiency, at the University of Illinois, 55-58
- Executive Committee, convention report of, 519
- F.E.R.A. and other students, scholarship of, at Pennsylvania State College, 123-26
- Fichtenbaum, Max, Use of Hollerith tabulating machines in preparing registration records, 171-86
- Financial Advisory Service, 168
- Foreign credentials, evaluation of, 231-34
- Fourth Educational Conference, 244-51
- French vs. American Universities, 87
- Freshmen, admission of, standards in the, 404-8
- Gerberich, J. R., and Kerr, Fred L., College scholarship and persistence of transfer students from junior colleges, 1-17
- Gifts for higher education, 251-53
- Gillespie, G. T., Belhaven College one course plan, 254-56
- Gladfelter, M. E.: Relation of the registrar to progressive movements in education, 424-30; value of several criteria in predicting college success, 187-95
- Government of Higher Education, The*, 84-85
- Grade: distributions in colleges of South Carolina, 127-35; publicity service by the registrar, 380-90
- Grades: college, a committee on, 390-95; of different institutions, present obstacles to comparability of, 395-403; student, the registrar's reports on, 361-74
- Grading, standards of, 412-14
- Gray, William S., Tenth Annual Institute for Administrative Officers of Higher Institutions, 70-73
- Guiding the progress of students in New College, Columbia University, 215-22
- Hart, Joseph K., *Education for an Age of Power*, 162-63
- Harvard University, and Yale University, student aid at, 253
- Haygood, W. C., and Sister Cecil, The library in the college catalog, 50-54

- Health service, student, and its place in the educational program, 223-30
- Hiram College study plan, 146-47
- Hobbies, the registrar and his, 435-41
- Hoffman, William S., Scholarship of F.E.R.A. and other students at Pennsylvania State College, 123-26; symposium—the registrar and his relations with the outside world, 416-41
- Hollerith tabulating machines, use of, in preparing registration records, 171-86
- Honor-point ratios, psychological test scores and, 142-44
- Howell, E. J., Summary of symposium—the registrar as an administrator, 446-48
- Hunter College, a pre-admission program, 136-37
- Illinois: Association of Collegiate Registrars' meeting, 150; Teachers Oath Bill, 75; University of, proficiency examinations at the, 55-58
- In Order of Their Eminence—An Appraisal of American Universities, 86
- In the journals, *see* Journals
- Inclusive Record, An, 271
- Index to Volume XI, 543-52
- Indiana State Teachers College, student personnel program at, contributions of the registrar's office to the, 442-46
- Institute for Administrative Officers of Higher Institutions, tenth annual, 70-73
- Jones, R. H., Grade distributions in colleges of South Carolina, 127-35
- Journals, in the: Academic Freedom and Teacher Tenure, 165; Adam Leroy Jones, 87; Administrative Officers, 167; American Association of Teachers Colleges, 168; College Handbooks, 168; Directory of the Junior College, 1936, 272; *The Economic Outlook in Higher Education for 1935-36*, 271; *The Education Digest*, 272; Education under Communism Contrasted with that under Capitalism, 270-71; *The Educational Record*, Supplement No. 9, 272; Financial Advisory Service, 168; French *vs.* American Universities, 87; An Inclusive Record, 271; In Order of Their Eminence—An Appraisal of American Universities, 86; Legislating Loyalty, 87; Long Range Prediction of College Achievements, 167; New Standards, 168; Non-Intellectual Aspects of Personality Facing Education, 85-86; Painless Education, 269; Present Practices in Administering Quality Points in 172 American Colleges and Universities, 272; Ranking System at Oberlin College, 168; Recruiting for Admissions, 88; Recruiting of College Students in Ohio, 86-87; Responsibility of Boards of Trustees for the Preservation of Academic Freedom, 165-66; The Scholarship Committee and its Problems, 167; Some Educational Bookkeeping, 166-67; What is Academic Freedom? 269-70; Who's Standardized? A Comment on British and American Education, 166
- Kandel, I. L., *Comparative Education*, 162
- Kansas Association of College Registrars and Advanced Standing Committees and Deans' meeting, 259-60
- Kentucky Registrars, Association of, meeting, 151-52
- Kerr, Fred L., and Gerberich, J. R., College scholarship and persistence of transfer students from junior colleges, 1-17

- Kerr, Fred L., Analysis of enrolments and degrees conferred over a six-year period, 493-503; the registrar and his professional duties, 102-6
- Keyserling, L. H., and Tugwell, R. G., *Redirecting Education*, 160-62
- Legislating Loyalty, 87
- Lehn, Mary B. J., Educational function of the registrar, 430-33
- Library in the college catalog, 50-54
- Limbert, Paul M., Guiding the progress of students in New College, 215-22
- Local Arrangements and Registration, Committee on, convention report, 513-14
- Long Range Prediction of College Achievements, 167
- Lyght, Charles E., Student health service and its place in the educational program, 223-30
- Mc Grath, Earl J., Office of the registrar, 1860-1933, 205-14
- Mc Hugh, John C., De Paul University honors, 523-24
- Mc Kinley—Roosevelt University, 238
- Marks, distribution of, 335-41
- Meetings: registrations of, 540-41; *see* Sectional meetings
- Membership: of the Association, 541; Second Vice-President's convention report on, 518-19
- Michigan, University of, co-operation between state university and high schools, 91-101
- Middle States Association of Collegiate Registrars' meeting, 152, 258-59
- Miller, E. C., *Practical Applications of the Punched Card Method in Colleges and Universities*, 80-82; vital statistics, 235-38
- Minnesota: Association of College Registrars' meeting, 261; University of, comparison of college aptitude test and rank in high school graduating class as factors for predicting freshman scholarship, 196-204
- Mississippi Registrars' Association meeting, 261
- Mitchell, J. P., Practice at Stanford University, 374-80
- National Youth Administration and the student, 342-51
- Nominating Committee, convention report of, 517-18
- Non-Intellectual Aspects of Personality Facing Education, 85-86
- Nebraska Association of Collegiate Registrars' meeting, 260-61
- Neville, K. P. R., Summary of open forum at convention, 486-92
- New College, Columbia University, guiding the progress of students in, 215-22
- New Standards, 168
- New standards for old, 107-15
- Newark, University of, 150
- News, *see* Educational news; *see also* Professional news
- North Carolina Association of Collegiate Registrars' meeting, 260
- Oath Bill, Illinois Teachers, 75
- Oberlin College, Ranking System at, 168
- Office: Forms and Filing Equipment, Committee on, convention report of, 514-15; of the registrar, 1860-1933, 205-14
- Ohio: College Registrars and Examiners, Association of, meeting, 150-51, 257-58; University, University College of, 144-46
- One course plan, Belhaven College, 254-56
- Open forum summarized by K. P. R. Neville, 486-92
- Oregon, University of, predicting academic achievement at the, 18-29

- Organization of the Association, 525-26
- Pacific Coast Association of Collegiate Registrars' meeting, 258
- Painless Education, 269
- Panel discussion, Section A—universities, professional and technical schools, 449-77
- Pennsylvania: State College, scholarship of F.E.R.A. and other students at, 123-26; University of, Senate investigation, 88
- Personnel program, scope and aim of a, 41-49
- Pettengill, True E., Comparison of college aptitude test and rank in high school graduating class as factors for predicting freshman scholarship, 196-204
- Philippine Islands, College of Fatherland, 257
- Practical Applications of the Punched Card Method in Colleges and Universities*, 80-82
- Practice at Stanford University, 374-80
- Pre-admission program, 136-37
- Predicting: academic achievement at the University of Oregon, 18-29; college success, value of several criteria in, 187-95; freshman scholarship, comparison of college aptitude test and rank in high school graduating class as factors for, 196-204
- Preinkert, Alma H., Registrar as a constructive citizen, 416-19
- Present Practices in Administering Quality Points in 172 American Colleges and Universities, 272
- Probst, Carrie Mae, Curriculum changes and the registrar, 478-83
- Professional news: American Council of Guidance and Personnel Associations' meeting, 75; co-operative study of secondary school standards, 141-42; Hiram College study plan, 146-47; Illinois Teachers Oath Bill, 75; Institute for Administrative Officers of Higher Institutions, 70-73; psychological test scores and honor-point ratios, 142-44; third report of Committee on School and College Relations, Educational Records Bureau, 147-48; University College of Ohio University, 144-46; University of California protesting Assembly Bill #107, 73-74; University of Chicago Senate investigation, 74; University of Newark, 150; University of Pennsylvania Senate investigation, 88; Wisconsin's Senate investigation, 148-49
- Professional reading: *The Chicago College Plan*, 82-84; *The Government of Higher Education*, 84-85; *Practical Applications of the Punched Card Method in Colleges and Universities*, 80-82
- Proficiency examinations at the University of Illinois, 55-58
- Program of twenty-fourth national convention, 239-43
- Progressive movements in education, relation of the registrar to, 424-30
- Projects, convention report on, 506-8
- Psychological test scores and honor-point ratios, 142-44
- Quality Points in 172 American Colleges and Universities, Present Practice in Administering, 272
- Questionnaire addict, registrar and the, 433-35
- Ranking System at Oberlin College, 168
- Reading, *see* Professional reading
- Recruiting: for Admissions, 88; of college students, 313-26; of College Students in Ohio, 86-87; student, 138-40
- Redirecting Education*: quotation, 79; book review, 160-62

- Registrar: as administrator—symposium, 442-48; as a constructive citizen, 416-19; curriculum changes and the, 478-83; as custodian of standards—symposium, 404-15; educational function of the, 430-33; grade publicity service by the, 380-90; and his hobbies, 435-41; office of the, 1860-1933, 205-14; and his professional duties, 102-6; and the questionnaire addict, 433-35; relations with the outside world—symposium, 416-41; relation with parents of future, present, and past students, 419-24; relation to progressive movements in education, 424-30; reports on student grades, 361-74
- Registrar's office as a service station for scholarship charts, reports, and statistics—symposium, 361-403
- Registrars: buying trends of, queries in the questionnaire on, 311-12; directory of, 273-308
- Registrations of the convention meetings, 540-41
- Report of Committee on School and College Relations, Educational Records Bureau, 147-48
- Resolutions, Committee on, convention report of, 515-17
- Responsibility of Boards of Trustees for the Preservation of Academic Freedom, 165-66
- Reviews, *see* Book reviews
- Robinson, J. R., Committee on college grades, 390-95
- Russell, John Dale, *The Government of Higher Education*, 84-85
- Salley, Ruth E., Pre-admission program, 136-37
- Scholarship: Committee and Its Problems, 167; and persistence of transfer students from junior colleges, 1-17
- Scribner, A. F., *The Chicago College Plan*, 82-84
- Secondary school standards, co-operative study of, 141-42
- Sectional meetings: Arkansas Registrars' Association, 152; Illinois Association of Collegiate Registrars, 150; Kansas Association of College Registrars and Advanced Standing Committees and College Deans, 76, 259-60; Kentucky Registrars' Association, 151-52; Middle States Association of Collegiate Registrars, 152, 258-59; Mississippi Registrars' Association, 261; Minnesota Association of College Registrars, 261; Nebraska Association of Collegiate Registrars, 260-61; North Carolina Association of Collegiate Registrars, 260; Ohio College Registrars and Examiners, Association of, 150-51, 257-58; Pacific Coast Association of Collegiate Registrars, 258; Section A, 449-77, Section B, 478-85; Texas Branch of A.A.C.R., 151
- Senate investigation: University of Chicago, 74; University of Pennsylvania, 88; University of Wisconsin, 148-49
- Shofstall, W. P., New standards for old, 107-15
- Sister Cecil, and Haygood, W. C., The library in the college catalog, 50-54
- Smith, Ira M., Co-operation between state university and high schools, 91-101
- Social forces affecting college entrance, 327-34
- Some Educational Bookkeeping, 166-67
- South Carolina, colleges of, grade distribution in, 127-35
- Southwestern College, divisional system at, 256
- Southwick, Arthur F., Standards in the admission of freshmen, 404-8

- Special Projects, Committee on, convention report, 505
- Standards: in the admission of freshmen, 404-8; of evaluation of transfer credits, 409-11; of grading, 412-14; new, for old, 107-15; secondary school, co-operative study of, 141-42
- Stanford University, practice at, 374-80
- Statistics, vital, 235-38
- Stephens College, new standards for old, 107-15
- Stephens, Winston B., Report on Fourth Educational Conference, 244-51
- Stradley, Bland L., Discussion of recruiting of college students, 322-26
- Student: aid at Yale and Harvard, 253; efficiency, measuring, 30-40; recruiting, 138-40
- Studies: college majors, 506; curriculum, 506; freshman class, 506; grade, 506-7; miscellaneous, 507-8; prediction of college success, 507; teaching, 507
- Study plan, Hiram College, 146-47
- Temple University, value of several criteria in predicting college success, 187-95
- Tests, uses and limitations of, in selecting and placing students, 352-60
- Texas: Branch of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars' meeting, 151; University of, use of Hollerith tabulating machines in preparing registration records, 171-86
- Thurstone, L. L., *The Vectors of Mind*, 164-65
- Transfer credits, evaluation of, standards of, 409-11
- Treasurer's convention report, 520-21
- Tugwell, R. G., and Keyserling, L. H., *Redirecting Education*, 160-62
- Turck, Charles J., Recruiting of college students, 313-22
- Tuttle, G. P., Proficiency examinations at the University of Illinois, 52-58; the registrar and his hobbies, 435-41
- Underwood, Lawrence C., Hiram College study plan, 146-47
- University College of Ohio University, 144-46
- Value of several criteria in predicting college success, 187-95
- Vectors of Mind, The*, 164-65
- Vital statistics, 235-38
- What is Academic Freedom? 269-70
- Whiteside, Annie C., Standards of grading, 412-14
- Who's Standardized? A Comment on British and American Education, 166
- Williams, Marian, Grade publicity service by the registrar, 380-90
- Winn, Elizabeth, and Drake, Raleigh M., Measuring student efficiency, 30-40
- Wisconsin, University of: Senate investigation, 148-49; student health service and its place in the educational program, 223-30
- Yale University and Harvard University, student aid at, 253
- Yoakum, C. S., Distribution of marks, 335-41

VOL. II • JULY, 1936 • NO. 4

BULLETIN

OF THE
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
OF COLLEGIATE REGISTRARS



PUBLISHED BY THE ASSOCIATION

The American Association of Collegiate Registrars

EDITORIAL STAFF

ROY W. BIXLER, University of Chicago, *Editor*

M. E. GLADFELTER, Temple University, *Advertising Manager*

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

ENOCK C. DYRNESS, Wheaton College, *Regional Associations Editor*

MISS ALMA H. PREINKERT, University of Maryland, *Professional Reading Editor*

MISS EMMA E. DETERS, University of Buffalo

ARTHUR H. LARSON, Eastman School of Music, University of Rochester

M. E. MATTOX, Eastern State Teachers College, Kentucky

J. P. MITCHELL, Stanford University

A. F. SCRIBNER, Valparaiso University

R. M. WEST, University of Minnesota

OFFICERS FOR 1935-36

ALAN BRIGHT, *President*

Carnegie Institute of Technology

J. R. SAGE, *First Vice-President*, Iowa State College of Agriculture and
Mechanic Arts

MISS ELINOR R. WELLS, *Second Vice-President*, Flora Stone Mather College
of Western Reserve University

J. R. ROBINSON, *Secretary*, George Peabody College for Teachers

MISS EMMA E. DETERS, *Treasurer*, University of Buffalo

ROY W. BIXLER, *Editor*, University of Chicago

EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

Notices must be accompanied by a remittance in full in favor of *The American Association of Collegiate Registrars* and should be sent to the Editor in care of the *Office of Admissions, University of Chicago*.

Notices will be inserted in the order of their receipt.

Rates: For four insertions, limited to not more than fifty words, including the address, two dollars, Additional insertions at the regular rate. Extra space will be charged at the rate of five cents a word.

In printing these advertisements the Association assumes no obligation as to qualifications of prospective employees or of responsibility of employers.

In making this page available to those seeking personnel and to those seeking employment, the Association expects that at least some reply will be made to all those answering announcements.

POSITION WANTED:—Registrar in college or work in connection with admissions office of college or university by a Ph.D. in Education and Psychology; eight years' experience in college as registrar and teacher; eight years' experience as high school teacher and administrator. Reply M, care Editor, Office of Admissions, University of Chicago. (2)

POSITION WANTED:—College graduate '36; woman, twenty-eight. A.B. in English, several hours social studies, thirteen hours secondary education, including educational measurements, psychology. Nine years stenographer on newspaper and four years in college secretary's office. Address T, care Editor, Office of Admissions, University of Chicago. (2)

POSITION WANTED:—Young woman, B.A., major English, eleven years secretary to president of a teachers college, desires position as assistant in registrar's office, or recorder, or secretarial work in college or university. Address reply to C, care Editor, Office of Admissions, University of Chicago. (2)

POSITION WANTED:—Young woman with Bachelor's degree and ten years' experience as Assistant Registrar and Recorder in large woman's college, desires position in Registrar's office. Good recommendations from present employers. Reply B, care Editor, Office of Admissions, University of Chicago. (2)

POSITION WANTED:—Young man, 22, desires position in office of registrar or admissions office. Other interests: contacting and corresponding with prospective students; work connected with the orientation of new students. A.B., Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, 1935. Reply MR, care Editor, Office of Admissions, University of Chicago. (2)

E. A. WRIGHT COMPANY

Engravers - Printers - Stationers

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Specializing in the
FINEST STEEL ENGRAVED
SCHOOL AND COLLEGE
DIPLOMAS

Specimens and special designs
on request

Sixty years of continuous service

College Bulletins and Catalogs

Thirty years in the college field enables us to offer you a wide experience, quality work, and a surprisingly low cost. Your inquiries are invited.

•

The John C. Winston Co.
Philadelphia, Pa.

REGISTRARS I

Find out the latest about Findex, the card indexing system with the automatic selector. Two new bulletins tell the story.

"THE USE OF RECORDS BY REGISTRARS" tells how the Findex System is used in analysing student records and in making statistical studies common to the registrar's office.

"HOW THE FINDEX SYSTEM IS USED BY UNIVERSITIES" tells of a number of important applications to the records of any educational institution. Either or both of these bulletins are sent gratis.

Write today and learn how simple Findex really is.

FINDEX SYSTEMS INC.
1572 W. Pierce Street
MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Diplomas

Made by

WELCH—CHICAGO



Combine Those Qualities of

Design and Craftsmanship

Characteristic of the Finest Traditions
in Higher Education and the Arts of

Steel Engraving

Lithography

Engrossing

Binding



W. M. WELCH DIPLOMA HOUSE

ESTABLISHED 1880

CHICAGO

DESIGNS MADE
ON REQUEST

PERSONAL SERVICE
FOR EVERY INQUIRY